Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

93 C

THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY

A JOURNAL OF THE FAITH, WORK AND THOUGHT OF CHRISTENDOM

Edited by Silas McBee

Volume V

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, EDINBURGH, MELBOURNE, AND BOMBAY
NEW YORK: GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
1917

KS1
C766
V.5

COPYRIGHT 1917
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

Volume V

March to December, 1917

Acklom, Moreby, M.A.
Samuel Butler The Third 182

Ainslie, Peter, D.D., LL.D.
Righteousness of the Unity of Christians 316

Attempt at Union between the Greeks and Latins at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439), The.
By Canon E. Vacandard 269

Augustine's Vision of Unity.
By Mgr. Batiffol, Litt.D 30

Batiffol, Mgr., Litt.D.
Augustine's Vision of Unity 30

Bevan, W. L., Ph.D.
Dr. Döllinger and the Reunion of the Churches... 411

Bevan, W. L., Ph.D.
Mysticism in the French Church 97

Binyon, Gilbert Clive, M.A.
Christianity and Hindu Character 359

W. J. Birkbeck and Russia Orthodoxy.
By Nicholas Glubokovsky, D.D. 568

Bishop Westcott's Teaching and the Times.
By Cecil Henry Boutflower, D.D 225

Boutflower, Cecil Henry, D.D.
Bishop Westcott's Teaching and the Times 225

Bréhier, Louis.
Origin of the Misunderstanding between the Roman Church and the East 484

Bremond, Abbé Henri.
Tillemont the Mystic 764

Brusilova, Vera Vladimirova and Her Sister Nadejda Vladimirova.
Saint Lore in the East 370

Buckham, John Wright, D.D.
What is Christian Experience? 345

Cairns, David S., D.D.
Christianity and the Science of Religion 528

Calkins, Raymond, D.D.
The Historical Approach to the Problem of Church Unity 467

Christ the Revelation of God.
By William Porcher du Bose, M.A. 655

Christ the Solution of Human Life.
By William Porcher DuBose, M.A., S.T.D. 201

Christianity and the Science of Religion.
By Davis S. Cairns, D.D 528

Christianity and Hindu Character.
By Gilbert Clive Binyon, M.A 359

Church, The.
By William Porcher DuBose, M.A., S.T.D. 1

Church and the Churches, The.
By Henry E. Jacobs, D.D., LL.D 253

Church and the World, The.
By J. K. Mozley, B.D 393

Church of Scotland and the Whole Church Catholic.
By James Cooper, D.D 593

Church Union.
By the Most Rev. Henry Lowther Clarke, D.D., D.C.L. 19

Church Unity.
By J. T. Farquhar, M.A 333

Churches and National Religion, The.
By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D 243

Clarke, Francis Edward, D.D.
A Factor in World Fellowship 153

Clarke, The Most Rev. Henry Lowther, D.D., D.C.L.
Church Union 19

Cooper, James, D.D.
The Church of Scotland and the Whole Church Catholic 593

Dr. Döllinger and the Reunion of the Churches.
By W. L. Bevan, Ph.D 411

DuBose, Horace M., D.D.
The New Age and the Church 323

DuBose, William Porcher, M.A.
Christ the Revelation of God..... 655

Du Bose, William Porcher, M.A., S.T.D.
Christ the Solution of Human Life..... 201

Du Bose, William Porcher, M.A., S.T.D.
The Church..... 1

Education of the Clergy and Reunion, The.
By F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., F.R.Hist.S., F.R.L.S..... 297

Ethical Element in St. Matthew, The.
By A. Van Veldhuizen, D.D..... 756

Factor in World Fellowship, A.
By Francis Edward Clarke, D.D..... 153

Farquhar, J. T., M.A.
Church Unity..... 333

Fourth Gospel in the Light of Modern Scholarship, The.
By A. T. Robertson, D.D..... 671

Garvie, Alfred E., M.A., D.D.
The Three Universalities..... 56

Glubokovsky, Nicholas N.
Orthodox Russia and Its Orthodox Priesthood.... 76

Glubokovsky, Nicholas, D.D.
W. J. Birkbeck and Russia Orthodoxy..... 568

Goudge, H. L., M.A., D.D.
The Reality and Limitations of the Authority of the Church in Relation to the Gift of the Holy Spirit.. 634

Heresy that Hinders, The.
By Edward Tallmadge Root..... 168

Historical Approach to the Problem of Church Unity, The.
By Raymond Calkins, D.D..... 467

Jacobs, Henry Eyster, D.D., LL.D.
The United Luthern Church in America..... 453

Jacobs, Henry E., D.D., LL.D.
The Church and the Churches..... 253

Jackson, F. J. Foakes, D.D., F.R.Hist.S., F.R.L.S.
The Education of the Clergy and Reunion..... 297

Johnston, Robert, D.C.L.
A New Disposition..... 720

Kelly, Herbert.
The United Church of Canada..... 435

Kilpatrick, T. B., D.D.
A Response to Father Kelly 617

Law, Robert, D.D.
St. Paul on Preaching 552

Llwyd, John Derwent, D.D.
Mysticism and Unity 730

Mathews, Shailer, D.D.
The Spiritual Challenge to Democracy 513

Mozley, J. K., B.D.
The Church and the World 393

Mysticism and Unity.
By John Derwent Llwyd, D.D. 730

Mysticism in the French Church.
By W. L. Bevan, Ph.D 97

New Age and the Church, The.
By Horace M. Du Bose, D.D 323

New Disposition, A.
By Robert Johnston, D.C.L. 720

Obbink, H. Th.
Something About the Study of the Bible 142

Origin of the Misunderstanding between the Roman Church and the East.
By Louis Bréhier 484

Orthodox Russia and Its Orthodox Priesthood.
By Nicholas N. Glubokovsky 76

Our Spiritual Peril as Neutrals.
By the Most Rev. Nathan Soderblöm, D.D. 91

Permanent Meaning of Propitiation, The.
By Clement C. J. Webb., M.A 122

Preparation for the World Conference.
By Newman Smyth, D.D 709

Prospects of Free Church Federation in England, The.
By W. B. Selbie, D.D 684

Protestantism and the Development of the Church.
By Herbert Symonds 693

Reality and Limitations of the Authority of the Church in Relation to the Gift of the Holy Spirit, The.
By H. L. Goudge, M.A., D.D 634

Response to Father Kelly, A.
By T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D 617

Righteousness of the Unity of Christians.
By Peter Ainslie, D.D., LL.D 316

Robertson, A. T., D.D.
The Fourth Gospel in the Light of Modern Scholarship 671

Root, Edward Tallmadge.
The Heresy that Hinders 168

Sacramental and Non-Sacramental Christianity.
By Rayner Winterbotham, M.A. 748

Saint Lore in the East.
By Vera Vladimirovna and Her Sister Nadejda Vladimirovna Brusilova 370

St. Paul on Preaching.
By Robert Law, D.D 552

Samuel Butler the Third.
By Moreby Acklom, M.A 182

Selbie, W. B., D.D.
The Prospects of Free Church Federation in England 684

Selbie, W. B., M.A., D.D.
The Churches and National Religion 243

Smyth, Newman, D.D.
Preparation for the World Conference 709

Söderblom, The Most Rev. Nathan, D.D.
Our Spiritual Peril as Neutrals 91

Something About the Study of the Bible.
By H. Th. Obbink 142

Spiritual Challenge to Democracy, The.
By Shailer Mathews, D.D 513

Symonds, Herbert.
Protestantism and the Development of the Church 693

Three Universalities, The.
By Alfred E. Garvie, M.A., D.D 56

Tillemont the Mystic.
By Abbé Henri Bremond 764

United Church of Canada, The.
By Herbert Kelly 435

United Luthern Church in America, The.
By Henry Eyster Jacobs, D.D., LL.D 453

Vacandard, Canon E.
The Attempt at Union between the Greeks and Latins at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439) 269

Van Veldhuizen, A., D.D.
The Ethical Element in St. Matthew 755

Webb, Clement C. J., M.A.
The Permanent Meaning of Propitiation 122

What Is Christian Experience?
By John Wright Buckham, D.D. 345

Winterbotham, Rayner, M.A.
Sacramental and Non-Sacramental Christianity ... 748

A Journal of the Faith, Work and Thought of Christendom

THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY is issued in March, June, September and December of each year.

ALL EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to Silas McBee, Editor, THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York.

ALL BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to the publisher, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, London, E. C.

Edited by SILAS McBEE

The Editorial Board

IN AMERICA

Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D., Baltimore
Rev. William Adams Brown, D. D., New York
Rev. W. P. Du Bose, S. T. D., Sewanee
President Robert A. Falconer, C. M. G., Toronto
Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, LL. D., Nashville
Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Denver
President W. Douglas Mackenzie, LL. D., Hartford
Dean Shailer Mathews, D. D., Chicago
George Wharton Pepper, Philadelphia
Robert E. Speer, D. D., New York
Rev. Henry Van Dyke, LL. D., Princeton
Rev. W. H. van Allen, D. D., Boston

IN AUSTRALIA

The Archbishop of Melbourne, Melbourne

IN CHINA

Rev. J. Campbell Gibson, D. D., Swatow
President F. L. Hawks Pott, D. D., Shanghai

IN GERMANY

Excellency Dr. von Bezzel, Munich
Professor Dr. Adolf Deissmann, Berlin
Professor Dr. F. Loofs, Halle
Professor Dr. von Schlatter, Tübingen
Pastor Julius Richter, D. D., Berlin

IN GREAT BRITAIN

The Bishop of Winchester, Farnham Castle
Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour, M. P., London
Professor T. R. Glover, Cambridge
Arthur Henderson, M. P., London
Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D. D., London
Rev. James Hope Moulton, D. D., Manchester

Rev. W. P. Paterson, D. D., Edinburgh
Rev. A. S. Peake, D. D. Manchester
Rev. William Sanday, D. D., Oxford
Rev. Principal Selbie, D. D., Oxford
Rev. William Temple, London

IN HOLLAND

Professor Dr. H. T. Obbink, Utrecht

IN INDIA

The Bishop of Bombay, Bombay
Principal A. G. Fraser, Ceylon
Professor A. G. Hogg, Madras

IN NORWAY

Professor Sir Lyder Brun, Christiania

IN RUSSIA

Archbishop Platon, Kishineff
Professor Nicholas N. Glubokovsky, Petrograd
Professor S. V. Troitzky, Petrograd
Professor John Sokoloff, Petrograd
Professor Wladimir P. Ribinsky, Kieff
Professor Theodore J. Titoff, Kieff

IN SWEDEN

The Archbishop of Upsala

Committees in America, Great Britain and the Continent include as writers and co-operators:

Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J.
Mgr. Shahan, D. D.
Professor E. A. Pace, D. D.
Rev. John J. Burke, C. S. P., and others, *in America*
Father Thurston
Father Sydney Smith and others, *in England*
M. Georges Goyau
Mgr. Batiffol
M. Leonce de Grandmaison

and others, *in France, Belgium, and Italy*

Other members of the Editorial Board will be added from the Continent and the Orient.

THIS JOURNAL has been founded on the conviction that a constructive treatment of Christianity will make for a better understanding between the isolated Communions of Christendom. The destructive method has had its full opportunity and will continue to have it and ought to have it. But it has developed no power to unite and it is most effective in promoting division.

It is not neutral territory that is sought, where courtesy and diplomacy would naturally tend to avoid issues and to round off the sharp edges of truth and conviction, but rather common ground where loyalty to Christ and to convictions about Him and His Church will be secure from the tendency to mere compromise or to superficial and artificial comprehension. The purpose is to create an atmosphere of mutual confidence and to induce a better understanding and a truer sense of fellowship.

This journal is and must be unofficial. The Churches are not and in the nature of things cannot make themselves responsible for it. It will be responsible for the kind of writers admitted to its pages, but the writers alone will be responsible for what appears over their own names.

Two conditions are imposed: First, that the Faith and Work and Thought of each Communion shall be presented in its absolute integrity including and not avoiding differences; and second, that no attack with polemical animus shall be made on others.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY recognizes the need that is finding expression in every organized Christian Church—the need of the impact of the whole of Christianity on the race. It has no scheme for propagating a system for the unity of Christian Churches. It will therefore have no editorial pronouncements. It offers itself rather as a Forum where the isolated Churches of Christendom may reintroduce themselves to one another through the things that they themselves positively hold to be vital to Christianity.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE invites the free, living and deliberate statement of actual, operative belief.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

The Church

By W. P. DuBose, D.D.

What is the Church? The God of Christianity cannot stop short with Himself; He must be God in His world—in all the "not Himself" that proceeds from Him, and that He would fill with Himself. The Christ of Christianity cannot stop short with Himself in heaven. The Christ of our *faith* is there,—because faith must see Him in the consummation and perfection of His part in the world. The Christ of our *hope* must be there, because hope too is of the end of our human participation with Him and in Him. But the Christ of the *process*—of the *all between* us and our faith and our hope—must be infinitely and awfully in the world and in ourselves, if His part is ever to be actually accomplished. In our faith and our hope we want Christ *there*—i. e., crowned and seated; but, for that, we first need Christ *here*—in the present fact, the stress and the strain, of the battle.

And He *is* here: The Church is as much the sacrament of His Presence, as His human Body was of the Presence, the Incarnation, of God in Himself. He is in us, *as* God

was in Him: there is no difference in the act and fact of His oneness with us from that of God's oneness with Him —*other* than that which we place there by our want of faith in it. Christ's human oneness with God was an act of perfect human faith under perfectly human conditions: an act of faith consummated in and by an act of perfect faithfulness. In other words He realized or actualized His faith in *fact:* the same faith that made Christ one with God will make us one with Christ; when the faith in oneness is complete, the fact of oneness will be complete.

For the present, and as a mere beginning of further applications which we should all make, let us take these truths more intimately into ourselves and our lives. Christ humanly made Himself one with God only as God divinely made Himself one with Him; it was of faith only as it was by grace. We make ourselves one with Christ only *as* Christ has made Himself one with us. *That* Christ has done in His Church, which is His Body, which is Himself. Until we take the Church for what it is—as *being* all that it means—oneness with Christ, and in Christ with God, and in God with one another and with *all;*—until we learn how to do that, and begin to *do* it, we shall not be either in truth or in earnest in the quest for the unity without which Christianity is a predestined failure.

The principle of the Church we see realized and revealed in the person of Christ as embodying humanity in Himself,—or as exhibiting in human life the conception, process, and completion of divine Incarnation. Christ is human redemption or salvation because He is human righteousness, human self-fulfilment through self-correspondence with reality. But the principle of the Church in Christ ought to be better understood as it comes home to us in its application to our common humanity. Our relation to the righteousness and life of Christ is our relation to the person of Christ: it is described simply as

our "being *in* Christ." That can have no other meaning than our being in the Church, as the body of Christ, and as Christ Himself. And that is so far off from our conception only because we are so far beneath God's conception of our humanity as the subject and object and body of His Incarnation.

The first note (and, if we take it aright, the one all-sufficient note) of the Church is unity. The Church originated in Christ, and was fully realized and expressed by Him in the words, "I and my Father are one." That was, of course, true of Him primarily only in His deity. But He came into the world to extend it to, to make it equally true of, His humanity also: and it was in His humanity that He uttered the words. And He came not only to make Himself, as one of us, Son of God and one with God, but to make us all, as one with Him and one in Him, in like manner one with and one in God. He was to be only "the first-born among many brethren"—the leader, captain, author and finisher of a common salvation. It is not being holy that makes us one with God, one in ourselves, or one with one another: it is the being one that makes us holy, that is our holiness. Oneness is the essence and substance of holiness, of righteousness and of eternal life: and the only oneness is that of God—the inherent, essential, and completive oneness of Divine Love.

The Church was complete in principle in Christ alone; it will be complete in application only in humanity. If our Lord's conquest of the world, His accomplished righteousness, was first an achievement of faith, an attained oneness with God—it was, in the second place, an act and victory of *obedience.*

The tremendous fact of the oneness of God with all, and of the oneness of all—if ever—only in God, and with God, and through God: which is the reason, and meaning, and end of Christ,—that becomes the essence and substance of Christianity.

The point I wish to make is this: Our Christianity is too far off from us; we think of the Incarnation of God and the presence of Christ as too exclusively in heaven, and not sufficiently on earth and in ourselves. We do not know that in the mind and heart and will of God *we* are the body of Christ and the subject of the Incarnation.

The process of God in His world—or more definitely, in the mode or degree of His relation to the world—cannot but compel our attention and thought, however it may for ever transcend our knowledge. In the first stages of the physical evolution in which we find ourselves to be —viewed now in the light of what it has become and is evermore becoming—we may discover the immanence of Somewhat which we may call Reason, Meaning, End or Purpose,—or God. We believe it to be indeed God, but a God Whom we can know, or know of, only by logical inference. The theory or postulate of God comes to us to account for a somewhat in the movement or direction in things which, we think, the mere things of themselves cannot account for. If this be God, then God so far is apparent to us, not in Himself, but only in the working of the things,—and so far as we know, may *be* only in and of the things.

But we have long since passed out of that world of the mere becoming of things into a higher world of knowing and controlling them. We are not any longer only inside and of, but outside and over the movement and direction of things,—and what is more, of ourselves. What has come in (we know not how) to make the great change, is not the mere appearance in phenomenon of self-consciousness and freedom, but the birth amid things of the *self* as subject of consciousness and freedom.

As ourselves no longer only immanent in but transcendent above the world of things in which we are—God no longer appears to us as only immanent in things but as infinitely and supremely without and above them: He meets us in the plane of our own transcendence or ob-

jectivity—that is, of our reason and freedom. However we may infer or postulate Him, and even worship Him, in the elements, forces, or operations of physical nature, we cannot see or know Him there as separate from these. To worship God in nature is simply to worship nature as God; and that is as far as nature-worship can go. But when we pass out of the world of mere natural and necessary sequence into that of the higher and wholly different calls and claims of reason and freedom, of holiness, righteousness and life, God is ready to come to us—or we are ready that God should come to us—not as mere force or movement, operation or law, no matter how majestic or divine, but as Himself, Person as we are persons, and transcending, as we transcend ours, even all His own presence and part in the world that comes from Him. When we know God not alone as Reason and Will and Purpose, but as Love and Grace and Fellowship, as the Life and Soul and Substance of our own righteousness or personal and social perfection,—then indeed we know Himself, and not some inference or predication about Him.

What we know of God in physical nature is expressed in the terms universality, uniformity, and unity. We know Him only *in* these and not in exceptions, violations, or contradictions of them. So in human nature we know God in the totality of His relations with us, only *in*, *with* and *through* what He is in ourselves—that is, in the integrity of what *we* become in Him. We know God as Person because we are persons,—as Spirit because we are ourselves finite spirit. If God is anything more than Spirit or Person we are agnostic of it because we do not share it with Him; but we are not agnostic of God in so far as He makes us partakers with, and partakers of, Himself in actual experience. Only we must not expect God to interfere with His own wisdom and love in making us persons, in putting us upon a reason and freedom of our own, any more than to violate the necessary laws and uniformities which He imposes upon nature. Not only na-

ture but human nature must work to its end, in accordance with, and in the integrity of, itself.

It might be said with reverence that if the term, along with the thing, Incarnation, had not been given us, the human instinct of it would not only have created the want but have found the expression. But indeed God could not have given it if men had not so wanted it. When we say that God could not, we mean only that He could not act outside of or counter to His own wisdom and working in the matter. He is as much in the instincts and wants, the purely natural impulses, of His world, as He is in their answer or supply—natural or supernatural. He feeds the raven which He caused to hunger and to seek its food; and He comes in person to meet the soul that hungers and thirsts for nothing less than Himself.

It is amazing how immediately, how definitely, and how perfectly Christianity, or the Incarnation, assumed its cosmic, as well as human aspect. It was the crisis, the turning point, of God's eternal relation with His world. The completion of nature in human nature, of mere sequence and necessity in reason and freedom and personality, is contingent upon and leads up to the further process of the perfection of human nature, the sanctification and glorification of man in God.

If we are seeking the emphasis, or the emphases, which will restore reality and power to our Christianity, we must begin with that upon the personality, what we might call the objectivity, of God Himself. We must lift God above nature and above ourselves, and learn to enter into personal relation with Him: we must be able to say and to mean—"Our Father Who art in heaven." And the heaven we mean must be not one in which God is, but one which is in God—which only God Himself is: the heaven of the love and grace and fellowship of God, of holiness and righteousness and life in God. If we seek *that* first, all the other things that belong to heaven will add themselves.

The Gospel as a mode or process of human salvation—i. e., redemption and completion—is best understood in contrast with law. Law means the fulfilling of nature, the realizing of self, the discharge of obligation and perfection of relation with God and man,—in a word, law means that spiritual as well as natural "correspondence with environment," which is the definition of life and blessedness. It *means* all that, but how far can it go towards effecting or enabling it? Nature by itself, or without *us*, will not do for us what it does for the bee or the beaver; the fact or the knowledge that righteousness *is* life and transgression *is* death will not make us righteous or give us life of ourselves. For that nature and law and self have all to be transcended, and it is wholly with that transcendence that the Gospel has to do: it is not so much the *What* as the *How* of salvation.

"The law," says St. John, "was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Grace from God, and truth (realization and reality) in us,—are the Gospel. Is the law then older than the Gospel by so many years as Moses was before Christ? The idea is universally repudiated in the Scriptures. All the Gospel in the New Testament was implicitly contained in the growing promise of the Old Testament. Going backward, in David was the promise of a universal and everlasting Kingdom of God or of Heaven upon earth. In Abraham was promised what was to be the principle and substance of that Kingdom—a righteousness of grace or of God through the human answer and acceptance of faith. Our Lord asked how *He* could be merely Son of David, Whom David himself had called Lord, and affirmed, "Before Abraham was I am." In Adam there was the primitive promise that though the serpent had wounded the heel of his seed, yet that seed should in the end crush the serpent's head. Humanity had fallen under the power of sin and death, but would in time turn by the grace of God and put those enemies under its feet. But the Gospel of Christ, or Christ Who

is the Gospel, was older even than Adam or man. He was before the world—the whole process of creation which (here at least) culminates, finds its reason, meaning, and end in man. "Thou lovedst me," our Lord says to the Father, "before the foundation of the world"; and St. Paul adds to this that "God chose us in Him before the foundation of the world . . . having foreordained us unto adoption (rather, unto realization or attainment) of sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself." The Gospel then is as old as the eternal divine thought or purpose of man: it is what God had in mind in his creation, in the planning of his nature and the predetermining of his destiny. Christ was then predestined humanity: man in, not only the mind, but the heart, wish and will, the forethought, provision, and prepared actual inheritance of sonship to God. As thus "Man from (and for) heaven" —Son of God by both origin and destination, Christ is carried back into yet prior and higher identification with God, is seen to be one with the reason, meaning and end or final cause of all creation—the Logos by Whom all things are, and Who eternally is with God, and *is* God.

The essence or substance of the Gospel is thus seen to be: humanity or *we* eternally and infinitely *in God*, and God through Christ, progressively (we might say evolutionally and eventually) *to be* in us. The Church is literally and exactly an *Ecclesia:* "Whom God foreknew He predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son (to the attainment of sonship through participation in the attained or accomplished human sonship of Jesus Christ); whom He predestined He called, whom He called He justified, whom He justified He glorified." The process of glorification or of becoming *de facto* sons is told on God's part, which is unfailing and invariable. Nothing is said of the multitudes who are called and do not hear or answer, and are therefore not justified or glorified,—not that it is not theirs to be, but that they "will not" be. The

gospel of human redemption and fulfilment is essentially and necessarily a "call," or an invitation: it has no message or meaning save to human freedom, to personal, spiritual, moral distinction, choice and self-determination. Apart from these *we* are not in it, and can in no wise be qualified or characterized by it. To make human quality or character or destiny any other than a "call" to our own faith, faithfulness and achievement or attainment is to annul and abolish the "us" or "we" in the matter, and destroy all image or likeness of God in us. God's parts in the process follow with something more than mere natural infallibility. He cannot contradict Himself: He cannot be anything less than the all-loving Self, the all-sufficient Grace, or the perfect divine Fellowship or Oneness with us—which are the factors on His part in our glorification or accomplished sonship. But even all that can be defeated by our non-concurrence: the human factors of faith—acceptance and reception of "God with us"; of hope, which sees and means *us* in the matter as well as God; of love, which is the only actualized "God with us"; —these human factors are as essential as the divine in the result of a human salvation. The Church, therefore, may be defined (as in I Cor. 1, 2) to be "The sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." That is to say,—it is humanity—on God's part already and always included in the love, grace, and fellowship which alone and perfectly can make it son of God, partaker of His nature and of Himself: but on man's part, "called" and waiting "to be," to become by its own act of acceptance and appropriation, son of God and partaker of His holiness, righteousness and eternal life. The eternal Word become flesh, sonship incarnate—the Love and Grace and Fellowship of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, placed at our disposal and made "ours to command"—can only give us the right and the power, it cannot force upon us, or dispense with in us, the *will* to become sons of God. There is forever in the heart of God,—would that it could sound ever

in our ears—the divine lament, "How would I—and ye would not!"

"One cannot but admire the unhesitating and unqualified manner in which the Church, in all its offices, utters the simple and straightforward language of faith. The trumpet gives forth no uncertain sound. By baptism we are dead with Christ and risen with Christ, and therefore *regenerate*. The only non-regeneration of one whom God has baptized is his own ignorance, or unbelief, or rejection of the fact that he *is* regenerate. But the Church assumes, or suggests, no such doubt or denial, but puts into his mouth only the language of faith, assurance, and fulfilment. As Christ died and rose, so the baptized person is to call and account himself dead to sin and alive to God. He is to *be* regenerate by believing himself regenerate; he is to realize the fact that he *is* regenerate. God has *made* him so; therefore he must account himself, and *be* so. And he will only not be so in fact through not being so in faith, i. e. through not believing that by God's grace and act he is so."

"The Church as a living Church should bring up her children in a living faith to realize their baptism, i. e., to make it real by accepting and treating it as real; to *be* children of God by believing that they *are* children of God, and not that they have to make themselves so by any act of theirs. And if we were born of and into such a living Church, our faith would be such a living faith, and our baptism would be, both to us and in us, such a living fact. At any rate, if it were not, the fault and failure would be, not in it, but in us: not in its not regenerating, but in our rejecting and making naught our regeneration. It would no more make baptism not a divine and a divinely efficacious act, than the fact of our Lord's inability to do His mighty works, on account of man's unbelief, made Him not a divine person."[1]

If we are to follow the transcendent, prehuman Christ

[1] See *Soteriology of the New Testament*, pp. 374, 375.

in His Incarnation, Resurrection, Ascension, Descent in the Spirit—the next step must follow co-equally and of necessity. If Christ is not as really and as actually present in His Church as in all His previous manifestations, energies, and activities—then Christianity has lapsed. If baptism into Christ does not mean, *is* not, for us, all that it meant and was for Him in His humanity —then by so much has it ceased to be what God made it and gave it. I do not say, as much *in* us as *in* Christ, for there is this immeasurable distance if not difference between Him and us: In Christ God has shown us the completeness of His love, grace, and fellowship working in the perfection of our human faith, hope, and answering love: He has shown us what we would be if we were in perfect response to Himself as Christ was. But even in Christ, however foreshortened, it was a process that required time: Christ, in a few years, *longam expositionem hominis in se recapitulat*, sums up all man's evolution or destiny in Himself. Because our faith, realization, reproduction of Christ in ourselves is a thing of endless growth, or of growth that ends not here,—therefore Christ here cannot be *in us* as God was in Him. But Christ *for* us, as an end, a goal, a destiny, to which we must always be looking and moving, Christ as our faith, our hope and love—is as real, as present and as complete in our baptism as He was in His own. What I mean is that the "given" in my baptism is the same as that in Christ's —however infinitely different the "received": it is my everlasting task, and privilege, and glory to make up that difference. All the love, grace, fellowship was there, and was there, on God's part, made mine; it is for me now, by never-ending growth in faith, hope, and love, to appropriate, assimilate, and convert unto myself all that is eternally mine in God. We are wholly in Christ by God's grace, it remains for Christ to be wholly in us through our faith. What we need to see is that God's gift to us of eternal life, through His Word to us and by His Spirit

in us, is absolute, unlimited, and unconditioned. Baptism receives us into the Kingdom of Heaven and makes it "ours." There is no limitation or condition about it —save the one of our own creation and interposition: viz., the question whether we will take it, and how much we will make it. Whatever of penalty, of death or of hell, of loss or torture to ourselves, there must of necessity be in the rejection, contradiction and consequent opposite of life, blessedness and heaven, is not of God's will or ordaining; it is the result of logical, natural, human consequence. If God says, "Be blessed," and we say "No," the curse of non-blessedness is not of His but of our own infliction. I am speaking only of or to those who have real opportunity and consequent responsibility, or accountability. The Gospel is of course only for those who have it: those who have it not we may safely leave to a God Who is all of love and mercy.

The "in me" of Christ—in Him as eternal Word, Promise and Fulfilment of us, in His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection, and Eternal Life—is as present and patent in the New Testament as the responsive "in Christ" which became at once the all-inclusive expression of Christianity's relation to Him. "To be in Christ and Christ in us"—as integral parts, continuation and extension, universality, and perpetuity of the Incarnation,— how was this to be effectuated and established as a permanent fact in the world? Was it to be left in the air, or written and left in a book? The Book or Bible was no part of the original institution of Christianity. It arose out of the actual and conscious life of the Church, and was the inspired means of recording and perpetuating that original consciousness for all time. The actual institution of Christianity might be said to have been in the two sacraments—of the new birth and the new life in Christ. But what were those two sacraments? Divinely given signs and seals or pledges of a deeper fact, parts of a fuller whole than themselves. The fact or whole

was achieved, accomplished, realized and fulfilled oneness of humanity with God—its now actually "determined" or effected "sonship in power according to the spirit of holiness, out of or through resurrection from the dead." But of this fact or whole Christ was only the beginning, the first-fruits, the first-born from the dead. God's predestination was of humanity, of us, unto fulfilment and inheritance of "sonship to Himself through Jesus Christ." "Whom He foreknew He foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son (the end or goal of our creation) —that He might be the first-born among many brethren." The whole process of Incarnation therefore was not terminated, it was only begun, in the Ascension of our Lord. The body of His individual, natural humanity was to grow through all space and time into the all-inclusive body of His corporate, spiritual humanity.

To say that Christ did not institute a Church is on a par with saying that He did not take our flesh, or rise from the dead, or ascend into heaven. It is a break or a halt in the process of His human task and activity just where it begins to apply itself to its real end and purpose. The Church is Christ's one real and whole sacrament to us of Himself—of our being "in Him" and "He in us." Any other sacraments are only acts and parts of that one —"outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual grace" which is ours only as we are in Him and He in us. It is not our faith, or our conversion, or anything whatever on our part, that places us in Christ or makes us sons of God. It is absolutely and altogether an act of God long before and wholly without us—in our creation, our predestination, and the incarnation in us of His Word and Spirit through our union with Christ. The function of faith is simply to accept, to appropriate, to make our own; true conversion is what will take place in us as the necessary result or fruit of a true faith. Just as in the human Christ the fact and reality of His saying "I and my Father are one," was the legitimate utterance

and expression of His perfect acceptance and realization of the baptismal word "Thou art my Son,"—so with us the essence and matter of true conversion is the reality with which we appropriate our baptismal oneness with Him and His with us. To be born anew in the Risen Christ, and to live in Him the ever new life of death to sin and resurrection to God and eternal life is the one simple and all containing truth of the sacraments.

It is not adding a new truth, it is only unfolding the most vital content of the one truth, to say that the Church as the Sacrament of Christ (as Christ Himself is to us the Sacrament of God) is not the medium of relation between "God and the soul, the soul and its God,"—if the soul be taken individually, as though religion were a matter solely between each man and his God. Christianity is distinctly a corporate and social act and life. As Christ, so God says: He that hath done it unto the least of mine hath done it unto Me—and there is no doing unto Me that is not unto all mine. I am willing to extend this so far as to say: There is no whole relation of correspondence and co-operation with God that is not in sympathy and unity with creation, with nature, with humanity, with all things and pre-eminently all persons. In Christ must be the ultimate unity of all these—of science, philosophy, business, politics, personal, social, national and international intercourse and relations—if He is to be unity with God. The divorce and disunity of the various parts of truth, which is one with God, must be overcome before we can be all-one with Him: to be alien from any is to be so far alien from Him Who is All-in-all.

The Church then is in the highest sense the sacrament of unity. Its one mark of unity includes and covers all the others, of holiness, universality and perpetuity. The Church may be defined as organized unity, or as unity incarnate: its earliest expression was, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints": i. e., in one

Holy and Universal Church, the Unity and Community, the Fellowship or Oneness of all Christians. Now what, again, was that oneness? It was primarily the oneness of each and all with Christ, or with God in Christ. But God in Christ recognizes no oneness with Him that is not oneness of all in Him with one another. There is no common or universal oneness with God that does not abolish between those who share it, I will not say all differences among themselves, but at any rate all differences that deny, contradict, defeat or hinder their oneness together in Him. "As many of us as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, —for we are all one in Christ Jesus." These natural differences and many others, did not actually cease in Christ, but they ceased in so far as anything in them constituted a bar, a hindrance, or a contradiction to their oneness with Christ or with one another in their relation to Christ.

There is no question in any of our minds that the one thing needed, the one condition of all life, is unity—unity in itself and unity with all else, oneness in inward constitution and with outward environment. Nature as such will never of itself bring about that unity. In the wisdom that underlies nature we are passing out of an immeasurable stage of strife and competition into a yet distant future one of unity, co-operation and order: order among ourselves, through slowly acquired, because rational and free, co-operation with God. Nature of itself will not give us that unity,—nor selfish prudence and experience, nor legislation, nor law, nor outward compulsion of any sort. Only the Spirit of God as new-creative power can accomplish it: "new" only in the sense of ever anew coming into demonstration and action as it can awaken the reason of man to wisdom, and the will of man to true freedom. The Spirit of God has moved upon the waters from the beginning; it begins to move in the sphere and realm of finite created and responsive spirit

only as "life becomes light" (attains to consciousness of God and itself) in man. Christ is the incarnation and manifestation of that Spirit not so much in its origin or potential existence in man, as in its historic coming to itself and its complete realization and revelation of itself in His person. And as Christ needed to come in the objective and concrete visibility of a human body at the first, so He needs to come again not in the abstract and supposititious conception of an invisible unity (which if it were true would manifest itself)—but in a visible body as before, the body of all in Him, in which in its unity man may see Him, even as in Himself man could see God.

That the Church, as herein understood, could come into the world only in some concrete and organic form is, I suppose, self-evident. That the Apostolate which Christ invested with His authority was the foundation and source of its future order is, I suppose, equally so. But to the Apostles the Church founded through them was the Body of the Risen Christ within it: *It* was the organ of His "returned," universal and perpetual presence and activity upon earth,—and they were but the members, the parts, to whom were committed the several functions. A permanent ministry to continue these functions after them I assume to have been the first condition of the organized permanent presence of Christ in our humanity. As a matter of fact the constituent elements of a visible Church as the Body of Christ have been and are among all—the faith, the sacraments, the ministry and the worship.

It may be assumed that if unity were—not only of the essence, but the very and sole essence itself of the Incarnation and the Church—one of the earliest provisions that would have to appear and establish itself would be the provision for world-wide and time-long unity.

The question, How to restore and conserve Unity—must go back to a prior one,—What is the Unity in question? Let us recall and repeat it in our Lord's own words: "I will not leave you orphans; yet a little while and the

world seeth me no more, but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." And in His last prayer: "Father, the glory Thou hast given me, I have given unto them: that they may be one, even as We are one; I in them and Thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as Thou lovedst me."

The Church, as we have seen, is the Body, Incarnation, or Sacrament of that Unity. In such a Union or Unity of two, there is the inevitable danger of holding one, either one, at the cost—even to the extreme of the denial—of the other. In the transcendent person of Jesus Christ Himself there have been from the beginning those who have held His divinity to the practical annihilation of any real humanity in Him; and on the other hand, those who have seen Him only human, to the practical exclusion of any real divinity. It is not surprising that in what we might call the corporate personality of our Lord —that which He shares with and in which He includes *us* —there should be similar extremes of contradiction, some denying and others exaggerating and distorting the real divinity of the Church. But all the way between these widest and even outside extremes there are few who call themselves Christians that would not resent the thought of being "out of Christ," that would not acknowledge the necessity of being "in Christ" and "one with Him" in all that "Unity" means or involves. And also,—all the way between these widest extremes there is no one point at which we can say that Christ is all *there*—to the exclusion of every, or of any, other point.

If then, in all our differences we are thus able to concentrate and agree upon the one necessity of being in Christ and of being one in Him, we must not despair of some ultimate Way to it. If we will cultivate and prepare the disposition, the will, and the purpose—God will

make the Way. The curse of the present state of Christendom is that our differences have erected such barriers and entrenchments that intercommunication, exchange, and mutual understanding are well-nigh impossible. Let us once begin in very reality to reverse this spirit, attitude, and policy—to bring together, compare, and contribute to the common good of the One End, the End of Oneness;—let us, I say, once begin on that line, and the differences that do not eliminate themselves will be turned into the higher service of deepening, broadening, and heightening the resultant Unity.

Church Union

By the Archbishop of Melbourne.

The principle of the Union of Christendom has made much progress in recent years. Not only has the idea become familiar everywhere, but the obstacles have been examined and there is much clearer realization of the conditions of the problem. The organization of Christianity amongst English speaking people is the result of age-long history, and everywhere there is a desire to face the weakness attending the inheritance by us of our fathers' controversies. These had their origin in questions which have lost much of their force in our own generation. The dissensions which had their origin in England and Scotland have been carried into new lands. Now they are largely without force or binding power, and in Australia, in America and elsewhere a new spirit is asking why these should be perpetuated from one generation to another. The force behind the movement is greater than the mere expression of the methods of healing the wounds of the Church. Everything in our generation is combining to add momentum to the force of union. No individual can as yet control these forces or combine them in an effective movement towards corporate union, but none the less their power is being felt. "This is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes." I write this article under no delusion as to its absolute value. The labours of some ten years in the cause of union have taught me many things, and, amongst others, the value of removing misunderstandings. Brought up as we all have been in our own views and traditions, our ignorance of each other's tenets and convictions is profound. One view only is common to

all, viz.: the conviction that what we believe is right and that others are hopelessly ignorant of the truth and obstinately adhering to their errors. Only sincere love of truth and the willingness to follow its leadings will destroy this self-complacency.

It was my privilege, a few years ago, to preside over a joint conference of members of the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church in Australia. I have ever felt that the Holy Spirit for whose presence we asked was verily and indeed with us. We examined many questions of doctrine and organization, and discovered, on each side, how much we hold in common. Our conclusions were made public at the time, and I venture to call them a most real contribution to the great cause of union. They have had an abiding effect upon our Church life in Australia, for those of us who took part in the Conference pledged ourselves to maintain its spirit, and the result has made itself felt in many ways ever since. Our method of proceeding was for each side to state fully and fearlessly the doctrines held according to the accepted formulae of each Church, and then, placing these side by side, to examine the points of difference. The plan excluded personal limitations and views, and gave us, in outline, the statements to which each of us was committed by the laws of his Church. The result was to show every one that, on the whole, we are witnesses to a common faith. The results of the Conference were embodied in a series of resolutions which are of sufficient importance to be reproduced in this article.

Resolutions passed by the Conference on 27th to 29th Nov., 1906:

1. "We hold the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as containing all things necessary to salvation, to be the rule and ultimate standard of faith."

2. "We accept the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as expressing the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, and as an adequate basis for any further formulated statement of Christian truth which may be needed."

3. "We agree that there are two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—which

must be ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him."

4. "That the act of ordination, when regularly administered, involves prayer and the imposition of hands."

5. "With regard to ordination, this Conference affirms the following to be essential conditions:

1. Full membership of the Church.
2. The inward and personal call of the Holy Spirit.
3. The recognition by the Church of this call after due inquiry into intellectual and spiritual fitness."

6. "The laying on of hands in ordination we understand to be a visible symbol of the bestowal, in answer to the prayer of faith, of authority and grace by the Holy Spirit for the work of the ministry."

7. "The authority to perform an act of ordination comes from God the Father, through Christ the Mediator, by the Holy Spirit as the Living Agent in the Church, and is exercised by the appointed officers of the Church."

Resolutions passed by the Conference on 15th to 17th Oct., 1907:

8. "We are opposed to the establishment of a State Church in Australia, and the President is authorized to make this fact known at his discretion."

9. "We recognize that up to the period of the Reformation there was one common succession of Orders, and that since that time the practice of Ordination has been continued, and the act of Ordination has been performed (a) in the Anglican Church by a Bishop and Presbyter, and (b) in the Presbyterian Church by a Presbytery presided over by a Moderator."

10. "That a Union of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania and the Presbyterian Church of Australia be effected and consummated by a joint Solemn Act under the authority and sanction of both Churches, in which each Church shall confer upon the Presbyters of the other all the rights and privileges necessary for the exercise of their office in the United Church, so that from the moment of such Union all the Presbyters of each Church shall have equal status in the United Church. (A minority of two Anglican members declined to recommend this Resolution, but expressed their willingness that it should be referred to the judgment of the Lambeth Conference.)"

11. "That some form of individual superintendence and government, constitutionally exercised, is expedient for the United Church, and that authority to execute such superintendence and government shall be conferred by a Solemn Act of Consecration duly administered on a Presbyter, with the title of Bishop exclusively attached."

12. "That the person to hold the office of Bishop shall be elected by the Church in accordance with Regulations duly authorized."

13. "That a Bishop, in his administration, shall be subject to all duly enacted laws of the Church."

14. "That the length of tenure of office as a Bishop having jurisdiction shall be determined by the Church."

15. "This Conference, while recognizing that the authority to perform an act of ordination is inherent in the Church, agrees that, as a matter of order, in the United Church, all ordinations of persons to the office of Presbyter as Ministers of the Word and Sacraments shall be by a Bishop and three Presbyters at least. And further, that in the consecration of every Bishop, three Bishops at least shall take part, and such Presbyters as may be appointed for the purpose."

16. "That liturgical and non-liturgical forms of worship be authorized, and that the use of the Book of Common Prayer be sanctioned, and additional forms of worship be sanctioned by authority."

17. "That there be an order of Deacons or Licentiates, who are ordained to office, and may be allowed to preach the Gospel, but are not allowed to dispense the Lord's Supper."

18. "That there be an order of Officers whose office shall be analogous to that of Church wardens and Elders, appointed to help in the pastoral oversight and the government of the Church, but not for the administering of the Sacraments, and that these Officers shall be elected by the Communicants of each several congregation, and shall be set apart to their office by a form of ordination without the laying-on of hands."

I claim for these resolutions a serious consideration, and maintain that they embody a piece of constructive work in the cause of union. In presenting them in your pages, I recognize that they will be subjected to much criticism, but, if we are to pursue the hope of union, any constructive work should be welcomed. I add now some reflections upon certain clauses:—

Clauses 1 and 2 define the ultimate standard of faith and accept the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as expressing in the form of creeds what is fundamental. They also limit the doctrines of any Catechism or formulated statement of Christian faith which may be needed to what is contained in these Creeds.

Clauses 3–7 deal with the two Sacraments of the Gospel ordained by Christ Himself and define the essentials of Ordination, both as to form, the Grace of Orders and the authority to ordain as a power bestowed upon the whole Church and exercised in its name by the appointed officers. Whilst acknowledging that all is done in Ordination in answer to the prayer of faith, the laying-on of hands is stated to be a visible symbol of the bestowal by the Holy

Spirit of authority and grace for the work of the ministry.

Clause 8 avoids the suspicion that any attempt was being made to work towards the recognition of a State Church in Australia. Every member of the Conference was too conscious of the value of self-government to desire to part with any of the freedom enjoyed and to give it to secular authority.

The Conference contemplated the formation of a United Church consisting of the Church of England in Australia, and the Presbyterian Church in Australia, and its conclusions on this subject form the most important part of the whole discussion.

Clauses 11–15. Without discussing the questions of Apostolic succession or historic continuity these clauses agree that it is expedient to have an Episcopal form of government. The length of tenure of the office is to be determined by the Church itself, though this does not interfere with the life-long position of a Bishop as a matter of Orders, because Orders and jurisdiction are two entirely distinct things. At the present time it is possible to elect a Bishop for a definite period, though this is not done, but the Superannuation Acts in some of the dioceses of Australia requiring resignation at a definite age and the assignment of a pension to the Bishop are of the nature of a limitation of the tenure of office. No one would suggest any period of say less than ten or fifteen years for office according to age, and this period could be extended, or the question could be decided by fixing an age for retirement. Even the Presbyterian members of the Conference agreed that any fixed period should be sufficiently long to allow an episcopate to develop its fullest powers. No theory of the Priesthood of the Church has been violated by provision for the resignation of the clergy or by providing pensions for their maintenance in old age. The Church of England members of the Conference required that in the succession of Bishops in the United Church everything which is now held essential to historic con-

tinuity should be provided at the beginning and to this every member of the Conference agreed. The successive ordinations to the priesthood afterwards are safeguarded in the words "all ordinations to the office of Presbyter as Ministers of the Word and Sacraments shall be by a Bishop and three Presbyters at least."

In the consecration of a Bishop, it was agreed that three Bishops at least shall take part. The remaining part of the sentence will be a surprise to some and a cause of stumbling to others. The words are added "and such Presbyters as may be appointed for the purpose." The words were carefully chosen and are permissory. Students of Church History will understand their significance. Behind them lies the contention of the Presbyterians that the Episcopate is the extension of the Priesthood. The former part of the clause provides the full canonical number of Bishops to secure the validity of the consecration, and the Church of England members having obtained this, yielded the remaining words though they did not deem them necessary.

I return to *Clause 10,* which defines the means whereby the union may be brought about. It is to "be effected and consummated by a joint solemn Act under the authority and sanction of both Churches in which each Church shall confer upon the Presbyters of the other all the rights and privileges necessary for the exercise of their office in the United Church." This is a bold proposal, but I am convinced that if the question of Church Union is to come into the region of possible accomplishment, some such Act will be necessary. So long as we discuss the problem in the light of definite theories of the Ministry and its authority and origin no progress is possible. If, on the other hand, we ask what every section has to bring into a United Church and whether such a Church is not one of the most pressing needs amongst English speaking people, we shall be ready to accept anything which does not destroy our historical continuity nor separate us from

those branches of the whole Church with which we are now in communion. A common ministry in a United Church must include all which is deemed essential by every component part.

The abandonment of the Episcopate would sever us from our own past, but the continuation of it with every safeguard of continuity introduced, would not do so. It will be noticed that the solemn act contemplated refers to Presbyters only, and that, because the Presbyterians, not at present having Bishops, would not contend for any rights and privileges belonging to this highest order.

The remaining *Clauses, Nos. 16–18*, though dealing with subjects now less controversial than in the past, are sufficiently important to call for special mention. Liturgical forms of worship have justified themselves in the eyes of all educated persons. The Conference, without any hesitation, accepted Liturgical worship whilst making provision for non-liturgical forms. The opinion was freely expressed by all that Liturgical worship would become universal. It further adopted the Book of Common Prayer as the Service Book of the United Church. Additional forms of worship are now freely sanctioned by authority in the Church of England.

Clause 17 provides for Deacons on exactly the conditions now laid down in the Church of England ordinal.

The last *Clause, No. 18*, deals with Church Officers corresponding to those of Church Wardens or Elders, and provides that while these are to be set apart to their offices just as Choirmen, Sunday School Teachers, and many others in the Church of England are now, they are not to receive any laying on of hands. The laying on of hands then is reserved for the three highest offices in the ministry of the Church. I have been told that these resolutions on the one hand sacrifice much for which the Church of England stands, and are an invitation to an act of schism and repudiation of principles, and, on the other, that they betray Presbyterianism. I desire only

to express my conviction that they are, on the whole, the necessary conditions of union on either side. Time alone will show whether or not the spirit of union is sufficiently strong to face the facts which must govern its realization.

Ten years have passed since the Conference which I have described was held, and it has often been asked what action has been taken upon these resolutions. Something has been done, and, in 1908, the resolutions were in the hands of the members of the Lambeth Conference, though no expression of official opinion was invited or given. The resolutions largely influenced the important report upon Re-union which was issued, and the Bishops undertook to close no doors of hope, but to further the cause of union by all means in their power. Subsequently certain theologians in the University of Cambridge undertook to issue a book upon Episcopacy in the light of all which modern scholarship has revealed. This book has not yet appeared, but it will be ready before the time of the next Lambeth Conference, and then the mind of the Church of England will, I hope, be expressed more definitely. It is not possible for me or any one in Australia to precipitate action which might result in schism, and make the present confusion worse confounded. The issues are too important for immediate and decisive action, but the hope which underlies the Melbourne Conference is not dead. It is only waiting for new opportunities of being heard as a sincere contribution to Church Union.

The conclusion at which I have arrived can be stated thus. There is no insuperable obstacle to union between ourselves and the Presbyterians on the side of doctrine. A united Church is not necessarily bound by the Thirty-nine Articles or by the Westminster Confession. It is bound by the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, as well as by a faithful acceptance of the Old and New Testament. In our own generation a silent and complete change has come over theological thought and conviction. The Sacred Scriptures have all their ancient power, which is

greater because it has been severed from the old theories of verbal inspiration. They can be studied now in their historical evolution and progressive revelation of God's will and purposes. They are seen now in their true historical setting, and are not treated as a book of charms in which any sentences from any parts are equally valuable. What is known as evolution is fully recognized in the continuous growth of moral and spiritual ideas, flashes of which shine everywhere, even in the least promising parts of Old Testament History.

I have formed one other strong conviction, viz.: the difficulty of adapting organization and government to new conditions, even after these may commend themselves generally. The old men who have ministered for the greater part of a life-time under any set of rules and forms shrink from a confession that what they have known and used is not the best possible. Granted that a United Church can be governed under a common ministry for the future, we shall always have the special position of men grown old in their own system, and some concessions will be necessary on both sides to meet the conditions of the transitional period when the new is slowly growing out of the old.

I close with a statement of my own conclusions on the subject of the historical Episcopate, using the language of a great scholar and historian in the nineteenth century. Bishop Lightfoot's essay on *The Christian Ministry* which appeared first, now nearly fifty years ago, is still the most impartial and illuminating discussion of the subject which I can find. Speaking of the influence of St. John the Evangelist, and affirming that Episcopacy as a form of Church Government could hardly have grown up without his sanction in a Christian Community of which he was the living centre and guide, he adds: "The existence of a Council or College necessarily supposes a presidency of some kind, whether this presidency be assumed by each member in turn or lodged in the hands of a single person.

It was only necessary therefore for him (St. John) to give permanence, definiteness, stability, to an office which already existed in germ. There is no reason, however, for supposing that any direct ordinance was issued to the Churches. The evident utility and ever pressing need of such an office, sanctioned by the most venerated name in Christendom, would be sufficient to secure its wide though gradual reception. . . . In this way during the historical blank which extends over half a century after the fall of Jerusalem, Episcopacy was matured and the Catholic Church consolidated." This and similar sentences enabled him in the second edition of his book (1881) to affirm that, whilst he had been scrupulously anxious not to overstate the evidence in any case, the result of his investigation had been to confirm the statement of the English Ordinal. "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that, from the Apostles' time, there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

The Episcopate as an institution, however, is not to be identified with the episcopate of history. There have been Prince-Bishops and Proud Prelates. Bishops have been Ambassadors of Kings, Chancellors, and Chief State Ministers, but none of these positions has any necessary connection with the office of a Bishop. These men in history often acquitted themselves with honour because of their great ability and special fitness for secular work. When I speak of the Episcopal office, I mean a position created for the Church's own advantage and government. I mean the holder of it to be a man who above all else is Pastor Pastorum, the defender of the faith of the Church, the wise leader of ecclesiastical affairs, the voice of the Church in all questions of conscience and morals, the centre of unity and one who in virtue of his office transmits the powers of the ministry to others. Such a man, ruling by constitutional means and guided in temporal

affairs by the advice of Clergy and Laity alike, becomes the representative of the Church in his diocese and speaks for all, because he utters the well matured convictions of the body of the Church. This is after all the Apostolic conception of the office, and we can leave on one side many things which have offended so long as we secure this true conception of a Bishop's work. I think the world would not turn from such a man, and the Church would rejoice in him because he becomes the centre of unity in diocesan life and the guide and counsellor of all faithful believers.

Augustine's Vision of Unity*

By Mgr. Batiffol, Litt.D.

It is not my intention in these few pages to present the ecclesiastical system of Saint Augustine, as I hope before long to devote a whole volume to that subject.[1] My aim is more simple. I propose to derive from that system dominating points of view that appear to me to bear immediately on certain controversial matters which, following the example of my friend M. Bréhier, it seems to me opportune to approach in an historical and objective way.

We shall then seek to discover what Augustine thought of Catholic unity, of the conditions of that unity and of the duty of being within it; and we shall try to say what part of that doctrine applies to the problem of the return of the Churches to unity as it presents itself today. I shall by no means exhaust the subject. I hope, however, to indicate the benefit that we may all reap from the lesson that the Bishop of Hippo teaches, far away as he stood from our disorders, so remote in time from our disputes!

I

Let my reader recall the position of Augustine. He was engaged in controversy with the African schism of the

*[In view of the difficulties of transmission of mail just now it has been impracticable to have the translation revised by the author. The citations from St. Augustine have been collated with the text in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. For the rendering into English of passages cited in Latin the translator is alone responsible.—The Editor.]

[1]Permit me to direct attention to the preparatory article which I published under the title of *L'Ecclésiologie de Saint Augustin* in the *Revue Biblique* for January and July 1915. This is a narrative of the controversy of Augustine with the Donatists.

Donatists, a controversy that occupied nearly the entire period of his episcopate, and in which, with the aid of the famous conference of Carthage of 411, he was a victorious controversialist. That long controversy was undoubtedly Augustine's most sharply contested and brilliant undertaking. The controversy that Augustine carried on with the Donatists brings out clearly that the two parties are agreed on the principle that Christ founded the Church and that there is only one Church. That agreement was attained at the very outset of the schism and the schism itself presupposes the principle, since the disagreement is on the point of how to know which of the two parties is the legitimate Church to the exclusion of the other. But where is the Church? It is where there is baptism, replied the Donatists; but the Catholics, they went on to say, have forfeited baptism from the fact that they have been traditors [i.e. betrayers of fellow-Christians or surrenderers of sacred books and vessels to persecutors]. To this reasoning Augustine finds it easy to oppose the maxim which Rome in the third century turned to account against Saint Cyprian—that the validity of the sacrament does not depend on the holiness or the unworthiness of the administrant. The *communio sacramentorum* is not necessarily a *communio sanctorum*. That is why the Roman Church, in so far as it is in the world, in so far as it is visible and engaged in its earthly pilgrimage, is a mixed society, in which sinners and saints remain together until the day on which God Himself shall separate the saints from the sinners, the wheat from the tares and the chaff.

With these premises established what shall be the note by which one may recognize in this world the Church of God? It will be its catholicity. By this word Augustine means the fact that the Church extends to all nations of the earth and that it has been so foretold in the Old Testament as it has been so willed by Christ in the Gospel. Of the two Churches that had been for

a century disputing the allegiance of the Christians of Africa, and in 411 opposed to one another two episcopates of equal strength, some three hundred bishops on each side, that alone is the Church of God that is incorporated in the *Catholica toto orbe diffusa*, since that *Catholica* alone rises to the design of God as it is manifested in Scripture and in history.

In this sense, opposing the schism localized in Africa to the *Catholica* spread throughout the whole world, Augustine can urge that the *Catholica* does not doubt the justice of its cause, just because it is the *Catholica*. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*, says Augustine, in a phrase justly celebrated since its application by Wiseman against the Tractarians in 1838 and since the abiding emotion that it evoked in Newman.

To be sure the idea of the *Catholica* that Augustine extolled and defended, that of a Church actually and really embracing the universe, *ecclesia toto orbe diffusa*, is, today, geographically inadequate, and even in Augustine's time geographical catholicity was an illusion of his geography. The Church which cherishes the idea of reuniting the whole human race in its bosom, conformably to the words *Docete omnes gentes*, has never yet realized that hope. It is then catholic, not in so far as it embraces the human race, but in so far as it is capable of embracing it, in so far then as it is not in contradiction with God's design for it.[2] Augustine's argument has then still pertinence, firstly, because the Church of God is a visible Church, in opposition to the Donatists, who tended to make of the Church a Church as impalpable in the world as the sanctity of the saints or the election of the elect; and secondly, that every Church that renounces its claim of being the Church of the whole

[2]On the idea of Catholicity read the pages of our most classic theologian, Hurter, in *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium*, Vol. i, Thesis 51; also Chapter iii of Book ii in P. Sertillanger's *L'Eglise*, which is devoted to the catholicity of the Church.

human race in order to be the Church of a single people or of a chosen group only, is a Church that falls short of the design of God.

To that the Donatists answered that the Church as ordained by God was of course universal, that it had once been so, but was so no longer; for of that *Catholica* there remained legitimately only the *pars Donati*, the party of the Donatists, which was alone sound, holy, and orthodox. To refute this allegation and this pretention was not difficult. Augustine recurs to it often with a vigour full of irony.

It still remains valid then in the ecclesiology of Augustine that the Church of God is one and that it is, in its unity, visible, universal. It is the *Catholica*.

II

In the ecclesiology of Augustine there is not the contradiction that some critics believed they had discovered between a Church that should consist of the number of the predestined and a Church that should consist of the baptized, in other words of an invisible and of a visible Church. For Augustine the economy of salvation willed by God obliges us to belong to the *societas congregatorum fidelium*, to the *communio sacramentorum*, and makes of this participation the positive, ordinary, preliminary condition of our belonging to the *communio sanctorum*. Christ in person converted Paul on the road to Damascus, but He sent him to Ananias to be instructed and baptized. An angel tells the centurion Cornelius that his prayers have been heard, but he bids him go immediately to present himself to the Apostle Peter, "*propter doctrinae tamen Sacramentorumque unitatem*" (Quaest. evangel. ii. 40). Augustine uses an ingenious comparison to show that the visible is the condition of the invisible: The strong woman works in wool and flax, for the man requires under garments made of linen and over-garments of wool. "You will

find one who says: It suffices me to render to God a hidden worship, to adore Him in my conscience. What need have I to enter a church and to mingle visibly with Christians?" And Augustine answers: Such a man wants a tunic of linen, but none of wool. The unity of faith is not enough then. There must be the unity of society. We form a single people, we who were aforetime many peoples, and this people is the visible *Catholica*. *Antea gentes, multae gentes, modo una gens . . . et haec gens ab oriente in occidentem . . . distenditur* (*Enarr. in Psalm. lxxxv. 14*). What follows will be less incontestable.

Augustine utterly repudiated the error of Saint Cyprian in asserting the invalidity of sacraments administered by heretics. But while he held the validity of sacraments by heretics, and by schismatics as well, Augustine thinks these sacraments inefficacious outside of the *Catholica*. The heretic or the schismatic can administer sacraments validly but since these are outside the Church none in their communion can receive these from them efficaciously. So the baptism by heretics or schismatics is valid, but the baptized does not receive in it the Holy Spirit as long as he remains a stranger to the unity in charity, that is, to the unity of all nations in the *Catholica*. He who, in effect, destroys the unity cannot possess the charity, and charity is the very Spirit of God. Similarly, the Christian who partakes of the eucharist outside of the *Catholica*, that is, in schism or heresy, does not benefit from the virtue of the eucharist, and, far from being profitable to him, the eucharist is harmful to him, being his condemnation. Similarly, since the remission of sins through penitence is given in the Church by the Holy Spirit, where the Holy Spirit is not there can be no remission. So there is no remission of sins save in the *Catholica*. Even prayer surely reaches God only if it rises from the holy mount and from the temple of God: now, this mount is the Church, this temple is the

Church: he alone prays efficaciously who prays in the unity of the body of Christ, that body which is made up of believers spread throughout the whole world but joined in the visible *Catholica*.

This teaching of Augustine is a radical doctrine which traditional Catholic theology has not accepted without some corrections; this namely, in the first place, that valid sacraments being efficacious *ex opere operato*, their efficacy cannot be suspended except in case of those who oppose an obstacle, *ponentibus objicem*, says the Council of Trent (Sess. vii. Can. 6). This *obex* is a subjective disposition, individual, formal.[3] The sin of schism or heresy, then, if it is material only and not formal, is not an *obex* to the efficacy of the sacrament.[4] The maxim "out of the Church no efficacious sacraments" is not, then, to be taken literally, any more than the axiom, "out of the Church no salvation."

But the schismatic incurs the risk of opposing by his schism, if it is formal, an *obex* to the grace of the sacrament, and under that hypothesis it is intelligible that Augustine should urge the schismatic to return to the *Catholica* where the sacraments that he had received will live again in their efficacy and where the sacrament that he is to receive will be thereafter efficacious. I will cite, as an example, a beautiful development of this thought from the commentary on the Gospel of St. John. "You pride yourself on possessing baptism," says Augustine to the Donatists, "you possess it indeed, but you possess it to your condemnation, because you possess it without the Church from which you took it."

Veni ergo, veni, et noli dicere: Jam habeo, jam sufficit mihi. Veni, columba te vocat, gemendo te vocat.

Fratres mei, vobis dico: gemendo vocate, non rixando. Vocate orando, vocate invitando, vocate jejunando: de caritate intellegant quia doletis illos. Non dubito, fratres mei, quia si videant dolorem vestrum, confundentur et reviviscent.

---

[3]Hurter, Vol. iii, pp. 304–305.

[4]M. d'Herbigny, Vladimir Soloviev, Paris, 1911, p. 240.

Veni, ergo, veni. Noli timere. Time si non venis, immo non time, sed plange. Veni, gaudebis si veneris; gemes quidem in tribulationibus peregrinationis, sed gaudebis in spe. Veni ubi est columba, cui dictum est: Una est columba mea, una est matri suae. . . . Spiritus Sanctus orbi terrarum datus est, a quo te praecidisti, ut clames cum corvo, non ut gemas cum columba. Veni ergo.

(*In Joann. evang. tract. vi. 15.*)

[Come, then, come, and do not say: I possess already; it suffices me. Come, the dove calls you, grieving she calls you.

My brothers, to you I say: call them grieving, not reviling. Call in prayer, call with invitation, call with fasting; let them know that you grieve for them in charity. I doubt not, my brothers, that they will know your grief, be confounded and come back to life.

Come then, come. Fear not. Fear if you do not come, yet fear not, but lament. Come, you will rejoice if you come; you will lament indeed in the tribulations of your pilgrimage, but you will rejoice in hope. Come where the dove is, of whom it is said: My dove is but one, she is the only one of her mother. . . . The Holy Spirit was given to all the world, from whom you have cut yourself off, that you might croak with the raven, not that you might sigh with the dove. Come then.]

The invocation to his hearers, the warmth with which he urges them to join with him, not by violence, *rixando*, but by prayers, fastings, and above all by feelings of charity, presents Augustine at his purest and noblest. Further on he turns to the controversialists and disputants among the Donatists and begs them not to trust too much to their learning and their dialectic, but to question themselves about their own charity:

I nunc, Donate, et clama: Disertus sum: i nunc et clama; doctus sum. Quantum disertus? quantum doctus? numquid linguis Angelorum locutus es? Et tamen si linguis angelorum loquereris, caritatem non habens, audirem aera sonantia et cymbala tinnientia. . . . Magna est fides, sed nihil prodest si non habeat caritatem. . . . Noli dicere Christo: Mihi et tibi quid est? Unitas enim Christi tibi loquitur. Veni, cognosce pacem, redi ad viscera columbae. Foris baptizatus es: Habeto fructum et redis ad arcam.

(*In Joann. evang. tract. vi. 20, 21.*)

[Come now, Donatus, and cry: I am well-spoken. Come now and cry: I am learned. How far well-spoken? How far learned? Have you ever spoken with the tongues of angels? Yet if you were to speak with the tongues of angels, not having charity, I should hear a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. . . . Great is faith, but it profits nothing if it have not charity. . . . Do not say to Christ: What have I to do with Thee? For it is the unity of Christ that speaks to you. Come, learn peace, return to the heart of the dove. You were baptized without: Have the fruition of it and return to the ark.]

In other words: Be as the dove from the ark which finds an olive branch, or better still an olive, since the olive is the symbol of charity, and finding charity, returns to the ark which is the *Catholica*. Or rather, that dove is the Church itself which brings back into the ark the olive branch that by the permission of God had borne its fruit where the olive tree had sprung up: *Quidquid ibi fructificavit redeat ad arcam per columbam* (Whatever came to fruitage there, let it come back to the ark through the dove). And after this rather subtle play of metaphor there is an appeal to the charity of the Catholics:

Gemamus, toleremus, speremus. Aderit misericordia Dei ut efferveat ignis Spiritus Sancti in simplicitate vestra, et venient.

Non est desperandum. Orate, praedicate, diligite. Prorsus potens est Dominus. Jam coeperunt cognoscere frontem suum. . . . Multi ignoverunt . . . aderit Christus ut cognoscant et ceteri.

(*In Joann. evang. tract. vi. 24.*)

[Let us lament, endure, hope. The mercy of God will come to your aid, so that the fire of the Holy Spirit shall glow in your simplicity, and they will come.

Be not discouraged. Pray, preach love. The Lord is mighty above all. Already men were beginning to know their shame. . . . Many did not know. . . . Christ will come that others too may know.]

Augustine's thought is primarily doctrinal and here his doctrine is in the depths excessive, and yet what noble feeling bursts forth from those depths. What a moving appeal to unity, regarded as the pledge of charity, of the charity without which there is no supernatural life!

Where charity is not, the Holy Spirit is not, for charity goes not without the Holy Spirit, nor the Holy Spirit without charity: now, outside the unity, outside the Church, outside the *Catholica*, the Holy Spirit is absent. This, of course, is to be understood not in a rigorous, but in a moral sense. Still, in a restricted sense Augustine could say with truth:

Accipimus ergo et nos Spiritum Sanctum, si amamus Ecclesiam, si caritate compaginamur, si catholico nomine et fide gaudemus. Credamus, fratres, quantum quisque amat Ecclesiam, tantum habet Spiritum Sanctum. . . . Habemus ergo Spiritum Sanctum, si amamus Ecclesiam: amamus autem, si in ejus compage et caritate consistimus.

(*In Joann. evang. tract. xxxii. 8.*)

[We, too, receive the Holy Spirit if we love the Church, if we are in the bond of charity, if we rejoice in the catholic name and faith. Believe this, brothers, in so far as any man loves the Church, in so far he has the Holy Spirit. . . . We have then the Holy Spirit if we love the Church: we love it if we abide in its bond and in charity.

III

The Church of God in this world is the mystical body of Christ of which the Risen Christ is the Head and of which Christians are the members. One recognizes here the Pauline doctrine of the Church regarded as the mystical body of Christ, a doctrine that Augustine developed, while giving to it the mark of his personality and infusing it with the pathos of his piety. This is a development peculiar to Augustine that since, first, the mystic body of Christ includes, by definition, only holy members, and since, secondly, the sinners who are found within the visible unity of the Church have not power by their presence to mar the holiness of the holy members, therefore it is in the visible unity that the mystical body of Christ must be placed and loved. We all, collectively, are the Church, the Holy Church: *Sancta Ecclesia nos sumus.* Not we alone who are gathered before the chair from which Augustine speaks: *Sed non sic dixi, Nos, quasi ecce qui hic sumus, qui me modo audistis;* but all the faithful of Hippo, all those of the Province of Numidia, all Christian Africa, all beyond the sea, all who fill the world; that is the concrete *Catholica*, and it is one only in its unity with the mystical body of Christ. *Sic se habet Ecclesia catholica mater nostra vera, vera illius sponsi conjux* (*Sermo, ccxiii. 7.* Such is the nature of the Catholic Church, our true mother, His true spouse).

This is the spouse whose chaste nuptials are told in the Song of Songs. Augustine will employ the occasion to say to his hearers:

Hortor vos, obsecro vos, per sanctitatem talium nuptiarum, amate hanc Ecclesiam, estote in tali Ecclesia, estote talis Ecclesia: amate pastorem bonum, virum tam pulchrum, neminem fallentem, neminem perire

cupiendem. Orate et pro dispersis ovibus. Veniant et ipsi, agnoscant et ipci, ament et ipsi, ut sit unus grex et unus pastor.

(*Sermo cxxxviii. 10.*)

[I exhort you, I beseech you, by the holiness of such mysteries, love this Church, be in such a Church, be such a Church. Love the good shepherd, a man so fair, deceiving none, wishing that none perish. Pray also for the scattered sheep. Let them too come, let them too know, let them too love, that there may be one fold and one shepherd.]

It might be supposed that the bride of the Song of Songs was the Church of the saints, and in fact it is so, but for Augustine this Church of the saints is included in the Church of all, and we may love it only under the image of the *Catholica,* although the *Catholica* may have its wrinkles and its spots:

Ecce tota Ecclesia dicit: Dimitte nobis debita nostra; habet ergo maculas et rugas, sed confessione ruga extenditur, confessione macula abluitur. Stat Ecclesia in oratione ut mundetur confessione, et quamdiu hic vivitur, sic stat.

(*Sermo clxxxi. 7.*)

[Lo, the whole Church says: Forgive us our debts; it has therefore spots and wrinkles, but by confession the spot is washed away, the wrinkle is smoothed out. The Church stands in prayer that it may be cleansed by confession, and as long as it lives in this world it will so stand.]

Augustine has no hesitation in identifying the mystical body of Christ and the *Catholica toto orbe diffusa.* Read, for instance, this letter addressed by him in 412 to a group of Donatist priests of Hippo, who had just returned to the *Catholica.* The letter was written while he was for the moment away from there.

Laetificavit nos vester adventus, sed non vos absentia nostra contristet. In illa enim Ecclesia sumus quae propitio Deo, licet usquequaque prorecta et toto orbe diffusa sit, unum tamem corpus est magnum unius capitis magni, quod caput ejus est ipse Salvator, sicut apostolus dicit. . . .

Proinde, dilectissimi, stabili mente et firmissimo corde, sub tam excelso capito, in tam glorioso corpore perstitamus, in quo invicem membra sumus. Unde etsi remotissimis terris mea longinqua esset absentia, in illo simul essemus a cujus corporis unitate recedere non debemus. Si enim nos una domus haberet, utique simul esse diceremur: quanto magis simul sumus cum in uno corpore simul sumus!

(*Epistu. cxlii. 1.*)

[Your coming has made us glad but let not our absence grieve you. For we are in that Church which, by the goodness of God, though it

be extended on every side and spread over the whole world, yet is one great body of one great Head, which head is our Saviour Himself, as says the Apostle. . . . Therefore, beloved, with stable mind and steadfast heart, under a Head so exalted, in such a glorious body in which in turn we are members, let us stand fast. So, though my distant absence were in the remotest lands, we are together in Him from the unity of whose body we may not draw away. For as, if one house sheltered us, we should say that we were together; how much more are we together when we are together in one body.]

Note well the precision of the affirmations of Augustine: *In Ecclesia sumus*, we are in the visible Church, in the Church *toto orbe diffusa*, and that Church is the body whose Head is the Saviour: Let us remain in that body, that is, in the *Catholica*, and let us be sure that however distant we may be from one another on earth we are yet one just so long as we do not separate ourselves from the visible unity which is identical with the mystical unity.

IV

The unity of the body of Christ in the unity of the *Catholica* is for Augustine no abstract theological proposition. It is a living thing, personified by him under the image of a mother. We have here the most remarkable trait of Augustinian ecclesiology, his filial devotion to the Church.

Augustine delighted in contemplation of the maternal office of the Church. He expresses this in words of gracious and pathetic tenderness. He felt even more than he expressed. Indeed, whatever may be Augustine's faith in grace considered as a gratuitous and sovereignly free gift of God, he knows that the Church is the instrumental cause which God employs just as He has used the apostolic preaching, as He has used the Gospel, as He has used the Law. Thus every believer is born in the Church, lives in the Church, by the faith of the Church and the sacraments of the Church. The mother Church conceives him, gives him birth, nourishes him, defends him; and for her he is ever a little child.

Mater Ecclesia . . . Haec vos de Christo concepit, haec martyrum sanguine parturivit, haec in sempiternam lucem peperit, haec fidei lacte nutrivit et nutrit, cibosque majores praeparans, quod adhuc parvuli et sine dentibus vagire vultis, horrescit.

(*Epistu. ccxliii. 8.*)

[Mother Church . . . She it is who has conceived you in Christ, has brought you forth with the blood of the martyrs, given you birth into eternal light, nourished you with the milk of the faith, and still nourishes while she prepares maturer food and shudders to find that though still small and toothless, ye cry.]

Augustine clings to this figure of the mother and child. He conceives of the heretics who combat the Church as *abortivi filii*. He thinks of lukewarm Christians as of infants whom the Church is unable to succeed in warming on her bosom, *fovendis parvulis minus idonea fieri dolet . . . quos gremio continet* (*Epistu. ccxliii. 8*). Elsewhere he takes up the metaphor of St. Paul of doctrine that is at first milk for the little children, *infantes*, and that afterwards becomes solid food for full-grown men, *perfecti*, and says candidly that those who think of themselves as *perfecti*, ought, if they find that they err in their knowledge, to return in humility to the little children's milk.

Si forte erras in aliquo, quare non redis ad lac matris? Quia si non extollimini, quia si non exultatis cor vestrum, quia si non ingredimini in mirabilibus super vos, sed servatis humilitatem, revelabit vobis Deus quod aliter sapitis.

Si autem hoc ipsum quod aliter sapitis, defendere vultis, et pertinaciter astruere, et contra pacem ecclesiae, fit vobis maledictum hoc, quod dixit: Super matrem cum estis et foris a lacte separamini, foris a visceribus matris fame moriemini.

Si autem perseveratis in pace catholica, si quid forte aliter sapitis quam oportet sapere, Deus vobis revelabit humilibus. Quare? Quia Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam.

(*Enarr. in Psalm cxxx. 14.*)

[If perhaps thou errest in aught, why dost not thou return to the milk of the mother? For if ye be not puffed up, if ye exalt not your hearts, if ye walk not in marvels beyond you, but keep humility, God will reveal to you that in which ye are otherwise minded. But if ye seek to defend that in which ye are otherwise minded and support it pertinaciously against the peace of the Church, that evil report applies to you which says: Since ye are above the mother, and set yourselves apart from the milk, apart from the vitals of the mother, ye shall die. But if ye persevere in catholic peace, if perhaps ye are in anything otherwise minded than as ye should be, God will reveal

it to you, if ye are humble. Why? Because God resists the proud and shows favour to the humble.]

We may wonder that to represent the Church Augustine does not take the Gospel figure of the hen gathering her chickens under her wings. Yet read this beautiful passage:

Securi ergo de promissionibus ejus, praeterita credamus, praesentia cognoscamus, futura speremus. . . . Non enim de se debet sperare Christianus: si vult esse firmus, vapore materno nutriatur. Illa est enim gallina colligens pullos suos, de qua improperatur illi civitati infideli Jerusalem: Quoties volui colligere filios tuos tamquam gallina pullos sub alas suas, et noluisti? Ecce relinquetur vobis domus vestra deserta. . . . Intremus sub alas gallinae hujus divinae sapientiae. . . . Amemus Dominum Deum nostrum, amemus Ecclesiam ejus; illum sicut patrem, istam sicut matrem; illum sicut dominum, hanc sicut ancillam ejus; quia filii ancillae ipsius sumus. Sed matrimonium hoc magna caritate compaginatur: nemo offendit unum et promeretur alterum. . . . Quid tibi prodest non offensus pater, qui offensam vindicat matrem? Quid prodest si dominum confiteris, Deum honoras, ipsum praedicas, Filium ejus agnoscis, sedentem ad Patris dexteram confiteris; et blasphemas Ecclesiam ejus? . . . Si haberes aliquem patronum, qui cotidie obsequararis, cujus limina serviendo contereres, quem cotidie, non dico salutares, sed et adorares, cui impenderes fidelia obsequia; si unum crimen de ejus conjuge diceres, numquid domum ejus intrares? Tenete ergo, carissimi, tenete omnes unanimiter Deum patrem, et matrem Ecclesiam. . . .

(*Enarr. in Psalm. lxxxviii. Serm. ii. 14.*)

[Secure then in his promises let us believe the past, understand the present, hope things to come. . . . For the Christian must not hope in himself: if he would be secure let him be nurtured in the warmth of the mother. For she is as a hen gathering her chickens, whence is the reproach for that faithless city, Jerusalem: How often would I have gathered your children as a hen her chickens under her wings and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate. . . . Let us come within the wings of that hen, the divine wisdom. Let us love the Lord our God, let us love His Church; Him as Father, that as mother; Him as Lord, her as His handmaid, since we are the children of the handmaid herself. But that marriage is joined by a bond of great love; none may offend the one and deserve well of the other. . . . For what will profit thee the Father unoffended who champions the offended mother? What profits it that thou confessest the Lord, honourest God, preachest Him, recognizest His Son, confessest Him sitting at the right hand of the Father and blasphemest His Church? . . . If thou hast some patron to whom thou dost daily homage, whose threshold thou wearest away in service, whom thou daily, I do not say, salutest but adorest, to whom thou payest faithful services; if thou utterest a slander against his wife, canst thou enter his house? Hold fast, beloved all, hold fast with one mind God the Father and mother Church.]

Augustine has the advantage that his controversy is with Donatists, a small Church confined to Africa with voluntary exclusion of the rest of the Christian world. The Donatists put into their secession an animosity, a violence, too evident to allow the Christian world to doubt their bitterness. We might then conceive a "secession" free from the fault of violence, which even in its very secession might invoke specious reasons, and that in all good faith. Against such a "secession," incapable of admitting that it is a schism, the ecclesiology of Augustine will retain a very efficacious value. If, indeed, the Church of God is one and visibly one, if, so conceived, it also has a right to the name Catholic, how can a "secession" that wittingly separates itself from unity feel that its conscience is secure?[5] The concept of unity and of catholicity is opposed to the claim of the right of separation made by secession. The very word *Catholica* becomes vocal and seems to say:

O filii mei, quid querimini de matre?
Quare me deseruistis, jam volo a vobis audire.
Accusatis fratres vestros, et ego laceror valde.
(*Psalmus contra partem Donati.*)

[O, my children, why vex ye your mother? Now would I hear why ye have abandoned me. Ye accuse your brothers and I am sorely hurt.]

We are brothers since we are sons of the same mother. We ought to go straight to our brother who has cut himself off from us and say to him:

Quid pateris frater? Fratres sumus, unum Deum invocamus, in unum Christum credimus, unum Evangelium audimus, unum Psalmum cantamus, unum Amen respondemus, unum Alleluia resonamus, unum Pascha celebramus; quid tu foris et ego intus sum? Plerumque angustatus et considerans quam vera dicantur, Reddat, ait, Deus majoribus nostris.

(*Enarr. in Psalm. liv. 16.*)

[What ails you, brother? We are brothers, we invoke one God, we believe in one Christ, hear one Gospel, sing one Psalm, answer one Amen, shout one Alleluia, celebrate one Paschal feast. Why art thou without and I within?—Frequently troubled and reflecting how

[5] D'Herbigny, op. cit., p. 247.

truly that was spoken, he will say: My God, cast it upon our ancestors.]

Shall we put in the balance the will of God for his Church and the will of those of our ancestors who by this secession have arrested its working? *Vos ergo quare separatione sacrilega pacis vinculum dirumpistis?* (*De Baptismo, ii. 7.* Why then have you by sacrilegious separation broken the bond of peace?). That you have broken the bond of peace is enough to put you in the wrong and to expose you to the accusation of schism and of sin. *Caritas enim christiana nisi in unitate Ecclesiae non potest custodiri* (Christian charity can be safeguarded only in the unity of the Church). Now, without charity we can avail nothing even though we may have baptism and a faith able to remove mountains. And Augustine concludes: *Teneamus caritatem, sine qua et cum Sacramentis et cum fide nihil sumus; tenemus autem caritatem, si amplectimur unitatem.* (*Contra litt. Petiliani, ii. 172.* Let us cling to charity without which though we have the sacraments and faith we are nothing. But we cling to charity, if we embrace unity.)

V

Unity is not a mere union of hearts in charity. It is adhesion to a truth given to the world by God and preserved in the world by the Church constituted by God as guardian of the truth.[6] The *Catholica* which has as

[6] Leo XIII in the letter *Praeclara gratulationis*, June 20, 1894, says: *Nulla quidem humana re, sed caritate divina communisque salutis studio permoti reconciliationem conjunctionemque cum Ecclesia Romana suademus: conjunctionem intellegimus plenam ac perfectam: satis enim esse nullo modo potest ea quae nihil amplius interest quam certam aliquam dogmatum credendorum concordiam fraternaeque caritatis commutationem.*

[Moved by no human thing but by divine charity and zeal for the common welfare we urge reconciliation and union with the Roman Church; we mean a full and perfect union; for a union can in no way suffice which is concerned with nothing more than some sort of concord about dogmas to be believed and an interchange of brotherly charity.]

its condition charity, but also orthodoxy, *regula fidei*, cannot be indifferent to the breaches that some have sought to make in the truth. It gives them the name of heresies and it repudiates them in the name of the truth which it has inherited from the Apostles. The Sabellians, who identify the Son with the Father, are heretics. The Arians, who deny the equality, *aequalitatem*, of the Son and the Father, are heretics.

Nos, id est catholica fides, veniens de doctrina apostolorum, plantata in nobis, per seriem successionis accepta, sana ad posteros transmittenda; inter utrosque, id est inter utrumque errorem, tenuit veritatem.
(*In Joann. evang. tract. xxxvii. 6.*)

[This, we (say), is the Catholic faith, coming from the teaching of the Apostles, planted in us, accepted from generation to generation, to be transmitted sound to posterity; between whom (i.e. the Sabellians and the Arians), that is, between the error of either, it holds the truth.]

Augustine would lay stress on this definition of the *regula fidei*. It may be thought that the *regula fidei* was for him purely traditional and retrospective. On the contrary it is alive, in this sense, that the Church has a mission, not of course to add to the deposit of faith, but to reject error as it arises, and error once anathematized remains error for ever:

Catholicae ecclesiae recta fides improbat tale commentum . . . improbemus itaque hujusmodi errorem, quem sancta ab initio anathematizavit Ecclesia.
(*Ibid. xxxiv. 2.*)

[The true faith of the Catholic Church disapproves such an invention. . . . So let us, too, disapprove error of this sort which the Holy Church from the beginning has anathematized.]

Catholic unity admits of varieties of observances from church to church, variations which in some cases may reach far back. There was a dispute if one should fast or not on Saturday. Augustine writes of this:

In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura divina, mos populi dei, vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt. De quibus si disputare voluerimus, et ex aliorum consuetudine alios improbare, orietur interminata luctatio, quae labore sermocinationis . . . utique cavendum est ne tempestate contentionis serenitatem caritatis obnubilet.
(*Epistu. xxxvi. 2.*)

[In matters about which Holy Scripture fixes nothing definite the custom of the people or the usages of predecessors are to govern. If we should dispute about such things and blame some on account of the practice of others, interminable contest would arise, with vain labour of disputation . . . which must be guarded against, lest in the heat of controversy the serenity of charity be obscured.]

Saturday fasting was observed in some African churches and not in others. In Rome and in some other churches of the West it was observed. Elsewhere and throughout the East nobody fasted on Saturdays. The friend to whom Augustine wrote was disturbed by a dissertation of some Christian in Rome (his name is not given) who insists that one must follow the usage of Rome and fast on Saturdays. Augustine reproves this writer for not having shrunk from casting reproach on nearly the whole of the Church: *Videbis eum pene universam Ecclesiam Christi, ab ortu solis usque ad occasum, verbis injuriosissimis nequaquam lacerare timuisse.* (You will see that he does not scruple to wound almost the whole Church of Christ, from the rising of the sun to its going down, with most injurious words). He did not spare even the Romans themselves. (*Epist. xxxvi. 3.*) To pretend that Saturday fasting was instituted by the Apostle Peter at Rome, while the other Apostles continued not to fast on Saturday with the rest of the Christian world and to argue from that for or against Saturday fasting is a discussion absolutely futile: *Interminabilis est ista contentio, generans lites, non finiens quaestiones* (This is an interminable contention, generating strife, not settling difficulties). Let us not engage in insoluble controversies in which the fundamental unity of the faith is not involved.

Sit ergo una fides universae quae ubique dilatatur Ecclesiae, tamquam intus in membris, etiamsi ipsa fidei unitas quibusdam diversis observationibus celebratur, quibus nullo modo quod in fide verum est impeditur. (*Epistu. xxxvi. 22.*)

[Let there be then one faith of the universal Church everywhere diffused as though in its very members, even though the unity of that faith be manifested with certain differing observances, by which the true content of the faith is not marred.]

Unity in the *regula fidei catholica* admits then of secondary diversities in rites and discipline, on the one hand,[7] and on the other it seeks to make men turn away from contentions that compromise charity and give no light. Augustine, however, does not doubt that the contest of the doctors against heresy often leads to a deepened knowledge of the faith. Time and again he affirms that in the *Catholica*, the faithful believe first on the manifest authority of God, and then rise from faith to the knowledge of faith. This is the well-known process of the Augustinian maxim: *Intellectum valde ama* (Love intellect with thy might). Without the heretics who have forced us to reflect and to discuss we should have as much faith but it would not be as intelligent:

Multi haeretici abundant, et ad hoc eos Deus abundare permisit, ne semper lacte nutriamur et in bruta infantia remaneamus.
(*In Joann. evang. tract. xxxvi. 6.*)

[There are many heretics and God permits them to abound to this end that we may not always be fed with milk and remain in dull infancy.]

Heretics, for instance, have not understood how the faith asserts the divinity of Christ and they have set out to reason arbitrarily on that article, *sapuerunt sicut voluerunt* (they were wise in their own conceit); so they raised difficult questions, *fidelibus catholicis quaestiones molestissimas intulerunt;* whence the necessity of controverting them:

Jam tunc necessitas facta est spiritualibus viris, qui aliquid secundum divinitatem domini nostri Jesu Christi, non solum legerant in Evangelio, sed etiam intellexerant, ut contra arma diaboli Christi arma proferrent . . . ne cum ipsi tacerent alii perirent.
(*Ibid.*)

---

[7] Leo XIII, in his letter *Praeclara Quaestionis* says: *Neque est cur dubitetis quidquam propterea vel nos vel successores nostros de jure vestro, de patriarchalibus privilegiis, de rituali cuiusque ecclesiae consuetudine detracturos.* (So there is no reason to dread that either we or our successors would try to draw you away from your rights, your patriarchal privileges, or the accustomed ritual of each church.) The whole passage of Leo XIII's letter might be cited, and even the whole letter, whose inspiration is so moving, so Augustinian.

[Then immediately it became necessary for spiritual men, who had not merely read in the Gospels but also understood something about the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they should bear the arms of Christ against the arms of the devil . . . lest while they held their peace others should perish.]

Those *spirituales viri* are the bishops and doctors whose preaching and writings brought about the condemnation of the Sabellians and Arians. It may happen that controversy, for the sake of greater clearness, creates new words: let us not be offended at the new words when the thing that the words express is older:

Sunt enim et doctrinae religionis congruentes verborum novitates . . . res tamen ipsae et ante nomina sua erant, et religionis veritate firmantur, qua etiam contra improbos defenduntur. Adversus impietatem quoque Arianorum haereticorum novum nomen Patris homousion condiderunt. Sed non rem novam tali nomine signaverunt.

(*In Joann. evang. tract. xcvii. 4.*)

[Verbal innovations are quite in harmony with religious teaching. . . . The things themselves existed before their names and they are established by the truth of religion by which they are defended against the reprobate. So against the impiety of the Arian heretics they devised a new appellation of the Father, homousion. But they did not by that name indicate a new thing.]

It is not paradoxical to see in these words traces of the theory of development of doctrine, a development which in so far as it concerns only the *intellectus* of the doctors is called theology, mediaeval theology or modern, as well as patristic, and which, in so far as the authority of the Church has intervened, is called the ecclesiastical *magisterium.*

Another conjuncture may arise where an article of faith is a matter of contention among Catholics because its meaning is obscure and needs to be cleared up. Men hesitate long, they remain undecided, but they discuss peaceably. At last a day comes when the legitimate authority removes the doubt which till then clung to the pre-existing truth. That is another instance of the normal development of doctrine. So in the matter of baptism the point contested in the time of Cyprian was at that date still obscure. Before the schism of Donatus,

bishops "filled with great charity" could be divided and hesitant on this point, without, however, renouncing peace; councils, each in its own region, could for a long time set up contradictory rules; but only up to the day when a plenary council of the whole earth defined the safest opinion and dissipated all doubts (*De Baptismo, i. 9*). At the very heart of faith, the light grows thus: first an obscure article becomes a subject of controversy, then the truth to which all rally grows clear. If the Apostle St. Peter had wished from the first to compel the Gentiles to Judaize "contrary to the rule of truth that the Church has since observed," we need not be surprised that Cyprian should have exacted the rebaptism of heretics and schismatics, "contrary to the rule of truth that the whole Church has since observed." Can one hesitate between the authority of a bishop or the authority of the council of a province, and the rule confirmed by the statutes of the universal Church? Truth progresses in the knowledge that one has of it and in the authority that asserts it. One must submit to the truth that is manifest and to the authority that asserts itself: *Venite ad Catholicam concordantem, quam Cyprianus non deseruit fluctuantem.* (*Ibid. ii. 20.* Come to the concordant *Catholica* which Cyprian did not desert while it was yet storm-tossed.)

Cyprian was ready to submit and he would have submitted as we submit. Cyprian, in fact, praised the Apostle Peter because he yielded with patience and concord to the opinion of St. Paul. With how much readier docility would he have yielded to the truth affirmed by the authority of the Christian world? *Quanto citius ipse cum concilio provinciae suae universi orbis auctoritati patefacta veritate cessisset?* (*Ibid. ii. 5.*)

In short, whether Cyprian embraced before death the opinion of Pope Stephen which he had combatted, or whether he died in the error that in good faith he professed, he died in unity—a great lesson for meditation

in controversies where unity should be preserved at any price till light comes, for fear that if one of the parties to controversy is cut off from unity his error may be transformed into an incurable wound. It may well happen that the truth is slow to reveal itself to the most learned. God permits this in order that the patience and the humility of their charity may be tested that it may bear more fruit. They teach us, too, how unity should be put before all else when men are divided on points of doctrine still obscure, and how men should accept truth when it shows itself, and that men must sacrifice to it the opinion they have defended.

Et ideo plerumque doctioribus minus aliquid revelatur, ut eorum patiens et humilis caritas in qua fructus major est comprobetur, vel quomodo teneant unitatem, cum in rebus obscurioribus diversa sentiunt; vel quomodo accipiant veritatem, cum contra id quod sentiebant, declaratam esse cognoscunt.

(*Ibid. ii. 6.*)

Here as in many another case the thought of Augustine passes far beyond the case of the Donatists he has in view. The passage we have just cited has prophetic value. It is a moving appeal to humility, to patience, to charity, especially in the more learned. Failure to read it has made many in history miss the secret of preferring unity to themselves and, if need were, of yielding themselves to truth as one resigns oneself to a sacrifice.

VI

A last lesson Augustine gives us—never to resign ourselves to the thought that our brothers should remain separated from us.

We who are members of the largest Church must not take pride in that, we must refrain from the tranquil pride that would lead us to disdain the heretics and the schismatics or to treat them with insulting rigour.

Praecisi sunt haeretici; sed neque contra illos nos extollere debemus, ne forte praecidi mereatur quem delectat insultare praecisis. Fratres mei, qualiscumque episcopi vox sonuit vobis, rogamus vos ut caveatis;

quicumque in ecclesia estis, nolite insultare eis qui non sunt intus, sed orate potius ut et ipsi intus sint.

(*Enarr. in Psalm. lxv. 5.*)

[Heretics are cut off, but we should not lift ourselves up against them, lest perhaps they, whom it pleases to exult, merit themselves to be cut off. My brothers, whatever episcopal voice sounds in your ears, we beg you take heed. You who are in the Church, do not exult against those who are not within, but rather pray that they may be within.]

How noble is this humility and this gentleness of the greatest doctor of the Latin Church! Again hear him saying to the faithful at Carthage in 411, in speaking to them of the Donatists:

Proinde, carissimi, exhorter Caritatem vestram, ut exhibeatis illis christianam et catholicam mansuetudinem. . . . Prorsus convicium audis, tolera, dissimula, praeteri. Memento curandum. Videte quam blandi sunt medici eis quos etiam mordaciter curant. Audiant convicium, praebent medicamentum, nec reddunt convicium convicio. . . . Fertote, obsecro, fratres mei.—Sed non fero, inquit, quia blasphemat Ecclesiam.—Hoc te rogat Ecclesia, ut feras, quia blasphematur Ecclesia. . . . Intellege tempus, habeto consilium. . . . Tolle jurgia, convertere ad preces. Noli conviciis repellere conviciantem, sed ora pro eo.

(*Sermo, ccclvii. 4.*)

[Further, beloved, I exhort your charity that you show these men a Christian and catholic gentleness. . . . Suppose you hear an insult—bear it, dissimulate, pass by. Remember the case calls for cure. See how gentle the doctors are even to those whom they lacerate to cure. They hear railings. They give the medicine. They do not return railing for railing. . . . Endure, my brothers.—But I cannot endure, some one says, for the Church is blasphemed. The Church asks this of you that you endure that the Church be blasphemed. . . . Regard the time. Take counsel. . . . Put away strife, turn to prayer, repel not the railer with railing, but pray for him.]

Here again the Augustinian teaching is of an eternal ecclesiastical actuality, for there is always occasion to recall that the enemies of the Church ought to be treated, like sick men, with skilled and gentle hands, *caute curandi, leniterque tractandi sunt*, and that the separated brothers who detest us are still our brethren.

Secondly, we must accord a very large place to our recognition of the good faith of our opponents. How many heretics, in fact, could say to you: We follow our bishops docilely; we are their sheep; they will give account for us:

Securi, inquiunt, sequimur episcopos nostros. Dicunt hoc saepe haeretici, quando veritate manifestissima convincuntur: Nos oves sumus, illi de nobis reddent rationem.

(*Sermo, xlvi. 21.*)

And this language, which is that of the faith of the simple, is normally irreproachable. So we must address ourselves not to the simple, not to the sheep, but to the learned, to the shepherds. We shall not be discouraged if they turn away from us or reply to us in a hostile tone. We will stretch out our hands to them though they do not take them. Nothing is so moving as the insistence of Augustine from the day he became priest to the last years of his episcopate in seeking every opportunity to come to an understanding with his Donatist critics, even with those whose evil conduct had been most wounding to him. Such a one was Maximinius, bishop of Sinitum, whom he adjured to reply to him in the name of *unius verissimae matris* (the one most true mother). A truce to retrospective recriminations, to accumulated suspicions, to prejudices that have arisen from the fact that they no longer talk with one another or know one another. Above all, at least, no appeal to the secular powers. . . .

Ut omnes qui nos audiunt intelligant non hoc esse propositi mei ut inviti homines ad cujusquam communionem cogantur, sed ut quietissime quaerentibus veritas innotescat. Cessabit a nostris partibus terror temporalium potestatum; cesset etiam a vestris partibus terror congregatorum Circumcellionum. Re agamus, ratione agamus, divinarum Scripturarum auctoritatibus agamus, quieti atque tranquilli quantum possumus petamus, quaeramus, pulsemus, ut accipiamus et inveniamus, et aperiatur nobis.

(*Epistu. xxiii. 7.*)

[That all who hear us may know that it is no proposal of mine that unwilling men should be forced into communion with anyone but that truth may become known to those who seek it in all quietness. On our side there shall be no appeal to dread of the temporal powers; on your side there shall be no intimidation by Circumcellian congregations. Let us contend about the thing itself, about reason, about the authority of holy Scripture; let us ask, question, knock, in such quietness and tranquillity as we may, that we may accept and discover, and that a door may be opened to us.]

In thus urging the bishop of Sinitum Augustine means that the Donatists should return of their own accord to unity, that their return should result from their persuasion, and their persuasion be determined by reason, by Scripture, by the facts. Let us seek together, he says to them, let us seek in cool blood and peaceably. The language of Augustine is straightforwardness itself, joined to clearsightedness as well as to charity, and he concludes with great dignity: *Deus et dominus noster tibi mentem pacatam inspirare dignetur, domine dilectissime frater.* (May our Lord and God deign to breathe into you a conciliatory mind, dearest lord brother.)

The circumstances will change; the attitude of Augustine will always remain the same, fundamentally. We must come to an understanding, in good faith and peaceably; we must not turn our backs on one another nor waste time in interminable altercations.

Hippo had as its Donatist bishop, Proculeianus, to whom Augustine determined to make a straightforward appeal. Evodius, a friend of Augustine, chanced to meet Proculeianus in a friend's house and the Donatist bishop told him that he wished to have a conference with Augustine in the presence of some honourable men (*bonis viris sedentibus*). With delight Evodius carried the proposal to Augustine who made haste to write to Proculeianus agreeing to a conference: "I will seek with you and discuss with you what difference, what initial cause, what reason has brought into the Church of Christ such a deplorable and grievous division." The letter of Augustine to Proculeianus (Epistu. xxxiii.) is a model of dignity and amenity. One feels that he was moved by the sign of appeasement manifested by the schismatic prelate, a disposition rare in that sect: "*Nonnulla in te praeeminent placidioris mentis indicia.*" (Some indications of a more conciliatory mind appear in you.) Augustine conjures him to be assured that he has never spoken of him in an offensive way, for against that he has always

been on his guard. Let the conference take place, then, prepared for by the prayers of both parties, presided over by notables whom Proculeianus shall himself designate; notaries shall draw up the minutes, which both Proculeianus and Augustine shall sign after having reread them. If even a conference seems premature, let it be preceded by an exchange of letters or by a private colloquy, wherever Proculeianus will, on condition that the conclusion of the colloquy be published or that the letters exchanged be read to the people on both sides, in order that some day the two separated peoples may make but one people, *ut aliquando non plebes, sed plebs una dicatur.* Augustine will abide by what Proculeianus may decide. *Prorsus sicut volueris, sicut jusseris, sicut tibi placuerit, libenter amplector.* (Just as you wish, as you order, as it may please you, I gladly accept.) The deference of Augustine is equalled only by the restrained emotion with which he urges his Donatist colleague to have done with these quarrels of another age for the love of the Church that suffers from them and of Christ whom we rend: *Rogo te, quid nobis est cum veteribus dissentionibus?* (*Epistu. xxxiii. 1–5.* What have we to do, I ask, with those ancient dissensions?)

Here is a supreme reason to force us not to resign ourselves to separation. If in fact, the Church were indifferent to the division of its flock into separated flocks, the faithful would reason that separation is nothing, that heresy is nothing, that schism is nothing. They would say:

Et hac et hac Deus est; quid interest? Homines inter se litigantes hoc fecerunt: utrumque colendus est Deus. . . . Utique si malum esset esse in parte Donati, loquerentur contra, redaguerent nos, satagerent lucrari illos; si errant, revocarent illos; si pereunt quaererent illos.

(*Sermo. xlvi. 15.*)

[God is on this side and on that. What difference does it make? Men contending with one another brought this to pass. God can be worshipped on either side. (If we were silent Donatists would say) If it were bad to be of the Donatist party they (the Catholics) would talk against it, they would seek to convince us, they would make much ado to convert such people; if such were really straying

they would call them back, if such were really perishing they would seek after them.]

Every rupture acquiesced in is an injury to the Church, a diminution of our faith in the Church, a step toward that anti-ecclesiastical individualism which persuades itself that ecclesiology is a product of human history and not a design of God, so that God is indifferent to these barriers raised by our own hands. *Et hac et hac Deus est!* The various protestantisms watch our discords and our ruptures and exult at them—I extend the thought of Augustine, I extend it in conformity with its logic, but I do not think I am false to it, and doubtless it would be indiscreet here to stress the matter further.

Let us at all events end with a passage of Augustine that is like a lyric canticle into which he has put all his faith in the restoration of unity, after the elimination of all particularisms, all nationalisms, all servitudes restrictive of unity:

Confiteantur tibi, *inquit*, populi omnes. *Existit haereticus et dicit, Ego in Africa populos habeo. Et alius ex alia parte, Et ego in Galatia populos habeo. Tu in Africa, ille in Galatia: ego illum quaero qui ubique habet. . . .* Confiteantur tibi populi omnes. *Ambulate in via cum omnibus gentibus, ambulate in via cum omnibus populis, o filii pacis, filii unicae Catholicae; ambulate in via, cantate ambulantes. Faciant hoc viatores ad solamen laboris. Cantate vos in hac via: obsecro vos per ipsam viam, cantate in hac via: canticum novum cantate; nemo ibi vetera cantet: cantate amatoria patirae vestrae; nemo vetera. Via nova, viator novus, canticum novum. . . . Qui in parte cantat, vetus cantat: quodlibet cantet, vetus cantat, vetus homo cantat; divisus est, carnalis est. Certe in quantum carnalis est, in tantum vetus, et in quantum spiritualis, in tantum novus.* (*Enarr. in Psalm. lxvi. 6.*)

[*Let all peoples confess thee*, he says. A heretic arises and says: I have people in Africa. And another from another side: I, also, have people in Galatia. Thou in Africa, he in Galatia: I seek him who has them everywhere. . . . *Let all peoples confess thee.* Walk in the way with all peoples. Walk in the way with all peoples, O sons of peace, sons of the sole *Catholica*. Walk in the way, and as ye walk sing. This let the wayfarers do as solace for their toil. Sing in that way, I beg you for the very road's sake, sing in that way. Sing a new song. Let none sing old songs here. Sing the love songs of your fatherland. None the old: a new way, a new wayfarer, a new song . . . whoso sings apart, sings an old song; whatever he sing, it is an old song, the old man is the singer; he is apart, he is carnal. Assuredly in so far as he is carnal, in so far he is old; in so far as he is spiritual, in so far he is new.]

The Three Universalities

By A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.
New College, Hampstead, London.

For all who are interested in the movement towards Christian unity, history must be full of significance and importance. To observe how differences of belief have arisen, and how these differences have been made into divisions of sects by the attempts to maintain and compel uniformity in the matter of creed, is surely one of the means of learning what must be avoided and what may be attempted to secure the oneness of the body of Christ in Him. To observe also how these differences have been, with the growth of Christian thought, transcended so as to cease to be any longer causes of division is to be encouraged in the task. In 1896 the Evangelical Union of Scotland was combined with the Congregational Union, and those who were once separated by doctrine are now united in faith and service. If the Union with Presbyterianism has not yet been accomplished, yet its Calvinism has been so far modified that doctrine would not be, as it once was, a barrier that could not be removed.

It is because of its bearing on the cause which the Constructive Quarterly exists to promote that I venture to submit to its readers the story of a controversy which at first sight might appear to be only of local interest.

The centenary of the birth of James Morison (born in the Secession Manse, Bathgate, Scotland, on the 14th of February, 1816) suggests a consideration of the doctrine with which his name is closely associated. And apart from the personal interest the history of the slow widening

of the Christian outlook is deserving of study, while the truth reached has important and urgent practical applications. For these reasons attention may be invited to the watchword of the Evangelical Union movement, the three Universalities: that God loves all, that Christ died for all, and that the Spirit works in all.

I

Max Müller has given an illustration of the racial relationship and religious affinity of three branches of the Aryan family which is of theological interest. The Veda phrase *Dyaush pitar:* sky father, has its counterpart in the Greek Ζευς πατὴρ, and the Latin name of the chief of the gods, Jupiter (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1878 p. 143). The Aryan family of peoples thought of the divine as akin to the human, and so could think and speak of the Fatherhood of the highest God. Not so the Semitic. The characteristic Semitic term is Ba'al (Lord). While it is not applied to the supreme deity, it is the title in different branches of this family of the god who owns the land, and who makes it fruitful, not by storms from heaven, but by springs from the earth. Lott, the Ba'al, was believed to control the waters from heaven as well as in the earth, and ownership came to mean also lordship. Ahab tried to combine the worship of Melkast, the Ba'al of Tyre, his wife's home (I Kings 16 : 32), with that of Jahveh; but Elijah declared the two worships to be mutually exclusive. There can be little doubt that the title Ba'al was also given to Jahveh: a number of names include the word, such as Johbaal, and Menbbaal, changed when the term was applied to heathen gods only into Johbesheth, and Mephibesheth ("besheth" meaning shame). In I Chronicles 12 : 5, we have Bealiah, meaning "Jahveh is Baal." Hosea, whose own broken heart taught him the love of Jahveh for sinful Israel, gives as a proof of the religious revival he hoped for the change of the title of God. "And it shall be at that day," saith Jahveh, "that thou shalt

call me Ishi (my husband); and shalt call me no more Ba'ali (my lord)" (Hosea 2 : 16). The prophet of the Exile represents God as assuring the people: "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you" (Isaiah 66:13); and one of the psalmists describes God's relation to men in the words: "Like as a father pitieth his children, so Jahveh pitieth them that fear him" (Psalm 103:13). But these analogues of human and divine relationship are confirmed and excelled in Jesus' revelation: "Our Father which art in heaven" (the Aryan thought completing the Semitic creed).

II

The revelation of the world-wide love of God has not, however, ended the conflict of the two ideas of the fatherhood and the lordship, or we may say the sovereignty of God. The two conceptions are not mentally exclusive; but it makes a great difference to which we give the priority, which word is noun and which adjective. If we think and speak of a fatherly Sovereignty, the Sovereignty fixes the scope and determines the character of the fatherliness. If on the contrary we believe and preach a sovereign Fatherhood, it is the Fatherhood that directs the sovereignty. Taking the Gospel of Jesus, or even the New Testament as a whole, as our standard of authority, can there be any doubt which of the two combinations we should hold? How then was the doctrine of election, in which sovereignty limited fatherhood, held so firmly, overcome so slowly? It seems to me that we can offer three reasons why the human heart, touched by the constraining love of Christ, did not more swiftly break the fetters that the human mind, mistaking error for truth, imposed upon it.

(1) The belief in the equal inspiration of the Bible in all its parts, in the authority for Christian Faith of the lowest as of the highest stages of the development of the divine revelation, led to a use of the Old Testament in

theology which made it anything but an interpretation of the Christian Gospel. We cannot estimate how much we owe to the literary and historical criticism which has delivered us from the bondage of the letter into the liberty of the spirit, which enables us to test and judge all that is contained in the Scriptures by the final and perfect revelation of God in Jesus Christ our Lord. A scholarly exegesis of the passages in the Bible on which the doctrine of election in its Calvinistic form has been based delivers us from the compulsion to accept that doctrine as part of the Christian creed.

(2) It is difficult for us to understand how human hearts with any tenderness or pity could tolerate this doctrine at all. The explanation is twofold. (a) As the dogmatic system based on the infallible authority of the Scriptures often demanded a sacrifice of the intellect in accepting what free reason would never have accepted, so the dread of impiety in challenging what was taught as part of the revelation of God to men, put a tyrannous compulsion on the affections. And men, themselves tender and pitiful, taught the doctrine of an arbitrary, irresistible deity. (b) But we must, even though it becomes us not to speak ill of the past to which we owe so much, add, that it has taken the Christian Church a long time to make fully and thoroughly its own the spirit of its Lord. If we recall the severity and cruelty of Christendom in punishing crime or wrong, in the treatment of dependents by those in authority over them, how slowly kinder modes and milder manners have come, we are warranted in affirming that the human receptivity for the Gospel of the grace of God has been slow in development, and that in turn theology retarded that development.

(3) There is, however, a reason worthier of respect. The doctrine would not have kept its hold so long had it not had deep roots in experience. (a) The contrast between morality and religion will lead us to the secret of its tenacity. In morality man is conscious of his own

liberty and responsibility; and so morality tends to affirm the sufficiency of man, and its conception of God tends to be deistic. In religion man is conscious of his weakness and unworthiness when confronted with the greatness and holiness of God; and religion saves man from despondency, if not despair, by recognizing the dependence of man on God, so that man seeks all his sufficiency in God alone. The religious consciousness when isolated, as in some forms of mysticism, tends to the pantheistic conception of God. Christianity is no less a morality than a religion; it is as ethical as it is spiritual, for its God is both absolute and perfect. (b) But even in the Christian the moral conscience and the religious consciousness are not always duly proportioned and harmoniously combined; and where the religious consciousness dominates, dependence upon God may be affirmed in a form which excludes both liberty and responsibility. When the Christian believer in his religious mood realizes his salvation, he thinks of it as God's act and God's act only. He has not chosen Christ but Christ has chosen him; he remembers not his own penitence and faith, he recalls only Christ's grace. That his salvation is Christ's act, gives him more certainty, confidence, courage, than were it his own. That this act of Christ has behind it as its explanation the purpose of God to save him bases his temporal experience on the eternal existence of God. Priceless is this religious assurance; and it has truth as well as worth. Salvation is the work of God in Christ, and an affirmation of the freedom of man in opposition to dependence on God, as in Pelagianism and Arminianism, does offend and challenge the religious consciousness.

The moral conscience must, however, be taken into account, and we must so conceive God's relation to man that God's saving act does not exclude, but includes, man's activity in penitence and faith. We must seek the synthesis of which dependence on God is the thesis, and the freedom of man the antithesis. In the doctrine of

election a religious assurance has been changed into a speculative opinion based on the subordination of the divine fatherhood to the divine sovereignty, on the conception of God as will without content, rather than will with holy love as its content; and consequently not only is the saint's gain ascribed to God, but equally the sinner's loss, and so ultimately there is left only one will in the universe, God's, damning no less than saving.

III

A brief historical survey will confirm the general statement. (1) Not only did the manner of Paul's conversion, which he himself describes as an abortion (ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι I Corinthians 15:8), lead him to hold the religious assurance of election, but his Pharisaic inheritance included a doctrine of predestination. In his argument in Romans 9–11 the speculative opinion is without reservation affirmed, it is God who has hardened Israel, even as He had hardened Pharaoh's heart (Romans 9:18. "He hath mercy on whom He will, and whom He will He hardeneth"). But it must not be forgotten that the passage is an *argumentum ad hominem*, that Jewish pretensions are being fought with Jewish doctrines, and even if Paul still held these Jewish doctrines theoretically, practically as the Christian apostle he breaks away from them in the conclusion of his argument, so satisfying and inspiring to him that he must needs burst into a doxology: "God hath shut up all unto disobedience that He might have mercy upon all" (Rom. 11:32). But those who claim his authority for this doctrine of election do not follow him to the end in his universalism.

(2) In Augustine there was the same experimental reason for affirming the religious assurance as in Paul; but one cannot doubt that his development of the doctrine was affected by the Manichaeism which for a time had held him captive. He affirms unreservedly man's sinfulness, lostness, and impotence to save himself. God

alone saves; He not only gives grace, but even the faith which claims the grace. If men are saved solely because God wills to save them, it follows that they are not saved because God also so wills. All who are not elected by God unto salvation out of the *masso perditionis* are left by God to perish. If they are not predestinated to sin, they are predestinated to the punishment which sin deserves, and are not saved from it by God's electing grace. The number of the elect is fixed, as it is predetermined, in God's plan. This doctrine was challenged by Pelagius in a shallow moralism which lacked religious depth and asserted human freedom at the expense of divine grace. The speculative opinion can be corrected only if justice is done to the religious assurance. Augustine was a religious genius as Pelagius was not.

(3) Luther, with an experience similar to Paul's and Augustine's, and influenced therein by both, affirmed no less vehemently the entire impotence of the human will, and the sole efficacy of the divine grace in salvation. But it was Calvin who gave to the doctrine of election the prominent position in his dogmatic system, based it on the sovereignty of God, and with ruthless logic worked out all its consequences. Apart from sovereignty, that is the unconditional freedom of God in bestowing, grace would not be grace. In Calvin's doctrine of predestination there is included the decree of reprobation as well as of election. God not only leaves the reprobate to themselves, but even hardens their hearts by withdrawing His Spirit, and using Satan as the minister of His wrath. As there is nothing greater than the will of God, "it must be regarded as the cause of everything that exists"; and man has no right to ask why God's will is exercised in this way or in that. In spite of the extreme assertion of divine sovereignty it is not quite certain whether he was a supralapsarian or an infralapsarian, whether he held that God for His own glory, that He might show His justice in punishing and His mercy in saving, predestined the fall of

man by an effective and not merely permissive decree, as he states both views. When he affirms that for every divine decree there is a good and sufficient reason, however mysterious, he is modifying the exaggerated statement of the absoluteness of God's will to which he is driven in the heat of controversy. While Calvin had an experience of conversion, yet his doctrine is less directly the fruit of experience than the outcome of a too rigidly logical mind.

(4) Christian thought could not long rest in these extreme positions. Melanchthon, unrebuked by Luther, adopted synergism, or the doctrine of a co-operation of the human will with the divine will in conversion. After Calvin's death the supralapsarian view was asserted and provoked the Arminian revolt. The five articles of the Arminian Remonstrance (1610) assert (1) that election is conditional, that is, dependent on God's foreknowledge that the elect will exercise faith; (2) that the atonement is universal, intended, if not efficient, in all; (3) that without renewal by the Holy Spirit man cannot exercise saving faith, or do any really good work; (4) that the grace which is indispensable is not irresistible; and (5) that it is uncertain whether all believers will persevere to the end. As regards the fifth article the Arminians afterwards became more definite in asserting the possibility of a lapse from grace. As regards the third and fourth articles, Arminianism is a distinct advance on Pelagianism, as it recognizes more fully man's dependence on God. These articles were condemned by the Synod in Dort; but in opposition a more moderate Calvinism was stated; the infralapsarian position is taken; differences in the degrees of assurance in believers are admitted; and the non-elect are represented as simply passed over. The part of the Dort Creed which is of special interest for our purpose is that which deals with the Atonement. The person of Christ gives infinite value to His death; how then can the blessings of atonement be limited to the elect? This

is the problem which has to be solved. As the atonement is infinite in value, there is an expiation sufficient for the whole world, and no man is lost because there was no atonement available for him. But in the divine intention, by surely an unconscious irony described as "the intention of love," only the elect were included, only they were given by the Father to Christ, and therefore for them alone is it efficacious. While the appeal of the Gospel is to be made to all, yet only in the elect does the Spirit inscrutably work, so that without any coercion they accept the call. While attempting to ward off objections from the moral standpoint, which recognizes human liberty and responsibility, the divine sovereignty is maintained by the framers of the creed; and to that fatherhood is subordinate.

(5) But the unrest continued. To meet the Roman Catholic objection to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, John Cameron at the Theological Academy of Saumur taught that the Spirit of God does not directly change the will, but enlightens the intellect. His pupil Amyraut (Amyraldus) went farther in modifying Calvinistic doctrine in teaching hypothetical, universal grace. God in some proper sense wants all men to repent and believe; in God's purpose there is no hindrance to the salvation of the penitent. The renewing grace, without which penitence is impossible, is however given only to the elect. In the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*, in the forming of which Francis Turretine exercised a dominant influence, this teaching is condemned.

(6) A further modification of Calvinism was attempted in the Federal Theology, of which Cocceius was the chief exponent. The covenant of works with Adam was followed after the Fall by the covenant of Grace. Historical relations between God and man are thrown into prominence instead of eternal decrees; and the bare sovereignty of God is modified by present relations between God and man. It was this Federal Theology which was expounded in an attractive manner in a book with a grand title:

The Marrow of Modern Divinity, which came to exercise so great an influence in Scotland that it very potently affected the course of its religious history. The author, whose initials E. T. only are given on the title-page, is unknown. The first part was published in London in 1645, and the second in 1649, and many editions were called for in England; but it was in 1700 that a copy of it fell into the hands of Thomas Boston, who was then groping for the light, and found in this book what he sought. In his account of the discovery he makes the conjecture that it "had been brought home from England by the master of the house, a soldier in the time of the civil wars." Others were helped by it as Boston was, and it was reprinted in Scotland in 1718. Its teaching, which had been made widely known by the "Marrow" men, was condemned by the General Assembly in 1720. The Marrow controversy prepared the way for the Secession in 1733. The distinctive doctrine of the book may be given in the words of its modern editor, Dr. McCrie: "The Marrow men, both in England and Scotland, dwelt much upon the love of God for the whole world, the offer of Christ to every sinner. They delighted in proclaiming that God the Father, moved by nothing but the free love to mankind lost, hath made a deed of gift and grant unto all men of His Son Jesus Christ. According to them the legatees under Christ's testament are not believers only, although in their cases only does the testament become effectual; the legatees are sinners of mankind universally and indefinitely, and every sinner of mankind is entitled and encouraged to put in and act upon this claim" (pp. xxviii–xxix). The "Marrow" men did not, however, abandon their Calvinism.

(7) But Calvinism was definitely abandoned and Arminianism preferred by Wesley, though not by Whitfield. His Arminianism has been described, however, as "on fire"; it had in him an evangelical passion and an evangelizing purpose such as it often lacked elsewhere. The difference

between Pelagianism and Arminianism, already noted, he further emphasized. He laid great stress on the necessity of the Spirit's working both in justification and sanctification, yielding in respect of the first the assurance of the believer, and in respect of the second Christian perfection, a state not of sinlessness, but of the steadfast rule within of the love of God.

(8) In Jonathan Edwards, the founder of the New England school, there is not only a defence of rigid Calvinism, but even an exaggeration of it in respect of man's moral impotence; for he maintains that determinism belongs to the notion of the will. Sometimes the divine sovereignty is affirmed without any qualification whatever. Great as was his intellectual power, his position is retrogression, not advance.

(9) Although Scottish Independency originated in an evangelizing movement, yet the view of a limited atonement prevailed. (a) But in 1830 Dr. Wardlaw published a work on the *Extent of the Atonement* challenging this position. Abandoning the view that there is any quantitative equivalence between the penal sufferings of Christ and the penalty on sinners thereby expiated, he held that it is a "vindicatory manifestation of the righteousness of God, in order to the free and honourable exercise of His mercy." The question whether Christ's atonement was adequate for all mankind or only for the elect, which arose under the old view, ceased to have meaning. If God's righteousness is vindicated, God is free to choose whether He shall exercise His mercy for all or only a few. Dr. Wardlaw held that Christ's atonement had universal sufficiency, and that therefore the Gospel was unconditionally free. With a timidity of spirit, and surely a lack of consistency in thought, he stopped short there, and asserted that while sufficient for all, it is efficient only for the elect who by the special influence of the Spirit are led to accept the gift of God. As the filial relation is by God's express decree limited to the elect, this even involves a

limited Fatherhood of God as well as a limited working of the Spirit. Only one of the universalities is conceded. (b) The next step, which now seems so inevitable, and from which we find it hard to understand how so many held back, was taken by the Rev. John Kirk, a Congregational minister, in 1842. In a series of addresses called *The Way of Life Made Plain* he maintained that "not only did Jesus die for every man, but that God's Spirit strives with every man, and that they who yield are the saved, and that they who resist are the unsaved." In their sympathy with these "new views" nine students were expelled from the Glasgow Theological Academy in May 1844; and the action was approved by the Congregational Union; but in 1845 a resolution prepared by Dr. Alexander was adopted in the Union which, while intended to maintain the position of Moderate Calvinism, was still so worded that even the adherents of the new views could have accepted it, as it avoided reference to the differences of the old and the new views. It was left to the churches to take such action as they might think proper; and there was correspondence between the Glasgow and neighbouring churches in Hamilton, Bellshill, Cambuslang, Ardrossan, etc., and also the Aberdeen, Woodside and other churches, resulting in a severance of Christian fellowship. The test question put was, whether the action of the Spirit in conversion is *general*—in all who hear the Gospel, or *special*—for those whom God has elected unto eternal life. While it is difficult for us now to understand the controversy, we must recognize the Christian spirit, the practical purpose, and the intense sincerity of all who engaged in it. (See Ross' *History of Congregational Independency in Scotland*, pp. 120–135.)

IV

This historical survey prepares us to appreciate Morison's contribution. James Morison, the son of Robert Morison, the minister of the Secession Church in Bath-

gate, was sent at the close of his training for the ministry to a very out-of-the-way rural district in the north of Aberdeenshire, called the Cobrach.

(1) Zealously devoting himself to his work, he had the joy of witnessing a revival of religion under his ministry. His practical experience drove him to reconsider his theological position, to a study of the Holy Scriptures. This resulted in his discovery of God's universal love and Christ's universal atonement, and he preached God's willingness that all should be saved, with many seals to his ministry in a wide-spread religious revival. When he settled in the Clerk's Lane Secession Church in Kilmarnock in October 1840, the power of the Spirit in the preaching of the Gospel was made as manifest in the South as it had been in the North of Scotland. He still held, however, the doctrine of eternal and unconditional election and irresistible grace.

(2) In his first writing, published in 1840, a tract in which he sought to answer the question, "What must I do to be saved?" he defines his theological position as follows: "Election, in order of nature, comes after the atonement; and when it is properly understood it is one of the most delightful doctrines of Scripture. It is so because it *secures* 'a seed' to Jesus. The harmony of doctrines I apprehend to be the following. God foresaw that all men would become hell-deserving sinners; He resolved in consequence of His ineffable love and pity to provide an atonement sufficient for the salvation of all; He resolved to offer this atonement to all, so that all should be able and all should be welcome to come and accept it as all their salvation. He foresaw, however, that not one out of the human family would be *willing* to be saved in this way; and then He elected, that all might not be lost, 'that Jesus might see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied.' He resolved to bestow on some such influences of the Spirit as would infallibly *dispose* them to accept what all others are able and welcome to take"

(Quoted in Adamsen's *Life of James Morison*, p. 79). Regarding this statement we may ask, why if God is resolved to offer salvation to all, He does not infallibly dispose all to accept it? Does God see who will be willing to believe, and give the Spirit to them all? And can willingness to believe be thus taken as evidence of God's election?

(3) In his second publication *Not quite a Christian*, a sermon on the text, Mark 12:34: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God," he insists that no man is a Christian unless he has been born again through faith in Jesus Christ. In 1841 he set forth in his book on the *Nature of the Atonement* the Governmental theory. Most unhappily he described it as a *talismanic something*, as an *expedient*. As there is no gain in stirring the embers of a dying fire, the details of the process by which he was suspended and then expelled from the ministry of the Secession Church in 1841 need not be given. It is his theological development which has special interest for us. As in evangelizing work and religious revival there is often a moral weakness, a few sentences from a letter to his father, written a few months after his expulsion may be quoted to show that he regarded holiness as the end of forgiveness. "I have of late been finding the most exquisite pleasure in seeing from the Bible that God's great heart's wish is not so much to deliver us from sin, not so much to make us heirs of heaven, as to make us meet for heaven. He by faith makes us heirs of heaven, not as an end, but merely as a means; that being made heirs by faith, we may be purified by the same faith, and sanctified, and made like Himself by the same truth believed. It is sweet to try all day and every day to please God, in every word, and look, and thought, and action." (Quoted by Adamsen cf. p. 211.) He had not yet abandoned Calvinism, but he assented unequivocally to man's liberty and responsibility. As regards "accountable beings" in contrast with "all irresponsible creatures," God sustains their faculties in

existence, but as to their moral operation He exercises no immediate control over them. He is the author of all that is morally good in them, by influencing them through the medium of the truth, but in no sense at all has He anything to do with their evil thoughts. . . . As to God's irresistible government over moral beings, I see none of it. It is resisted every day" (pp. 214–215). When urged by friends to admit that the elect are those who believe in Christ, he answered with deep emotion, "Ah, brethren, you wish to drive me to be an Arminian! That I cannot be, with the light I at present possess. My work meantime is to preach the Gospel so as to bless my fellow-men for time and eternity, and to expound, as the Spirit enables me, the sacred oracles" (p. 216). The theologian in him was subordinate to the evangelist; and logical consistency waited on practical necessity. He would not abandon the old and accept the new further and sooner than the interests of his work required.

(4) In his treatise on *Saving Faith* (1842) he identifies faith and belief, or being persuaded that the Gospel is true; he insists that this proximate includes the ultimate object, Jesus Christ the Redeemer, who alone saves, but who must by belief be admitted into contact with the mind, and agrees that "trust, love, obedience, follow as necessary moral and spiritual consequences" (p. 222). This statement of the matter has proved liable to misapprehension, faith has been confined to belief, and the Gospel as a plan of salvation has been substituted for Christ as the object; and so orthodoxy has taken the place of vital union with Jesus Christ.

(5) Assailed by Calvinists on the one hand for his inconsistency in holding the doctrine of election, and along with this affirming God's love for all and a universal atonement, and urged by others to recognize an operation of the Spirit as universal as the love of God and the atonement of Christ, he at last in 1843 was led to the three universalities. "The divine Spirit is in the heart like the

divine Son and the divine Father, and since the Father does love all, and the Son died for all, it cannot be the case that there is discord in the holy and happy Trinity, discord in the aims and operations of the divine Persons. It cannot be the case that the holy and happy and loving Spirit really refuses to do His part in the economy of mercy in behalf of millions upon millions of those whom the Father sincerely loves and for whom the Saviour really died. No, this cannot be the case, for God is as truly harmony as He is light and love" (pp. 235–236). This statement is curious in two respects. (a) The Godhead is represented as society rather than as personality, a firm in which the partners might not all be agreed. This is surely tritheism, the penalty Christian thought pays for the ambiguous meaning of the word "person" in the doctrine of the Trinity. (b) Again the Calvinistic doctrine is surely here misrepresented; in it no unwillingness of the Spirit in contrast to the Father and the Son is, or has ever been affirmed; but the Father, who has elected some only, gives the Spirit only to the elect. But by this curious misrepresentation Morison hides from himself the inconsistency of the position he had hitherto maintained in affirming a universal love of God, and a limited operation of the Spirit in accordance with the will of God.

(6) An association to further the new evangelizing movement, and to defend its new theological position was needed, and the Evangelical Union was founded at meetings held in Kilmarnock May 16th, 17th, and 18th, 1843. While the common orthodoxy of the day was in other respects adopted as the basis of union, the new position was asserted as follows: "God, because of His infinite benevolence towards the whole world, and no doubt also for the purpose of benefiting the whole universe (Eph. 3:10) by displaying the exceeding evil of sin, the immovable stability of His government, and the breadth and the length and depth and the height of His love,

sent His Son Jesus into the world in the likeness of sinful flesh and to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world without distinction or exception." Thus the two universalities Morison had held for some years were defined. The third universality which he had just reached is as unambiguously expressed with just the same separation of the work of the Spirit as has been noticed in Morison's confession of his change of view. "In using His influence He is no respecter of persons. And although circumstances permit much more to be done for one rather than for another, and for one more than another, yet He equally desires the salvation and sanctification of all" (p. 239). Surely more logically consistent and more scripturally correct would be the statement that God who loves all, as He gives Christ to die for all, so also sends forth His Spirit unto all to save all. The universal love of the Father through the universal grace of the Son in the universal fellowship of the Spirit is a conception which affirms the unity of the Godhead in saving as the putting of the three universalities side by side does not. The formulation of the truth is at least not as happy as it might be. Unhappily too the view of faith already criticised is reiterated. "Simple belief of God's record" falls far short of Paul's view of faith. It is no disrespect to Morison to recognize his limitations as a theologian. In him we find primarily the evangelist and secondarily the practical type of Christianity; but the speculative and the mystical are both lacking.

(7) It is not necessary to follow the story any further. The survey of the theological development before the time of Morison shows that Christian minds and hearts could not rest under the yoke of rigid Calvinism, but that attempts were again and again made, if not to cast it off altogether, yet to make it a little easier. These attempts, if lacking in logical consistency, are more in accord with the spirit and the purpose of the Gospel than is Calvinism itself. This sketch of Morison's theological development

shows that he was no rash and reckless innovator; that he took no step forward until he was forced to take it, not so much by logical consistency as by practical necessity; that the last thing he thought of doing was to form a new denomination; and that the thing he was concerned about was to preach the saving Gospel.

V

His Gospel, I believe with all my heart, still holds the field. I have already indicated that a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, both more scriptural and rational than the tritheism, to which the orthodox dogma inadvertently betrays Morison, would lead us to present not so much three co-existent universalities, as one consistent universality, the love of God through the grace of Christ in the fellowship of the Spirit in all and for all.

(1) Further, this universal love of God we should describe as the universal Fatherhood; for I hold it unwarranted both scripturally and naturally that we should limit, as some contend, the Fatherhood of God to the saved. It is a verbal logic which does not correspond with real reason to hold that the terms *father* and *son* must be correlative in the relation of God and man, so that God becomes Father only when man becomes son. The Fatherhood is an eternal reality in God, even if the sonship becomes a temporal realization in man; and the promise, pledge and power of the temporal realization is in the eternal reality.

(2) Again, the universal atonement of Christ results from the universal Fatherhood of God, for in the Cross of Christ God's fatherhood is through the Son's grace both judging and forgiving the world's sin, in order that all men may be saved. We have got beyond such questions as whether the penal suffering of Christ is the quantitative equivalent of the penalty measured by the whole human race or only by the elect; or how a sacrifice of infinite value to God can have only a limited sufficiency for, or

efficacy in, men. For we think of the death of Christ not quantitatively, but qualitatively. From this point of view the Cross is so final and perfect a manifestation of the holy love of God that nothing more and nothing else than that Cross avails to convey to all men the redeeming, and reconciling love of God.

(3) It is because of the moral and spiritual content of the Cross, the love of the Father through the Son, that the universal appeal of the Spirit of God to the reason and the conscience of the whole race is made. Any other conclusion is impossible. The sufficiency of the grace of Christ as the expression and exercise of the universal love of God involves its efficiency to enlighten, quicken and renew all men by the Spirit of God. While we recognize human liberty and responsibility in receiving or rejecting this salvation, we must not obscure human dependence on God, Father, Son, and Spirit, in the experience of salvation. The work of the Spirit is not something superadded to the love of the Father, through the grace of the Son, but the Spirit is the inward energy of that eternal reality through that historical manifestation.

(4) This doctrine is not, however, universalism. Both the Scriptures and experience teach us that God's love, Christ's grace, the Spirit's work may be resisted and rejected. Beyond that testimony we must not go, whatever hopes we may cherish. But this Gospel does impose the universal obligation of making known to all men the love of the Father through the grace of the Son in the fellowship of the Spirit.

VI

The history which we have been studying enforces a duty on each one of us. As the doctrine of the universality of God's purpose to save had in James Morison a practical motive in his evangelistic labours, so should it have a practical application for us today. As we have abandoned the doctrine of irresistible grace and emphasize

man's liberty and responsibility in the exercise of saving grace, so do we recognize that it is by human agency and human agency alone that the Spirit of God works universally in the world. The universal Gospel confers the missionary obligation without any distinction of home and foreign. What God intends for all men, but confers only by the men who have been saved, should be brought within the reach of all men. Otherwise the saved are disowning a debt of gratitude they owe to the Saviour and a debt of compassion they owe to the sinners whom He died and lives to save. It was in a religious revival that James Morison found the truth of the three universalities; how more fully can his name be remembered and honoured than by such a quickening and renewing of the life of God in the Christian Churches as will inspire more varied and constant effort to bring to all mankind the love of the Father through the grace of the Son in the fellowship of the Spirit?

Orthodox Russia and its Orthodox Priesthood*

By Nicholas N. Glubokovsky, D.D.,
Professor at the Imperial Orthodox Ecclesiastical Academy, Petrograd.

To the memory of William John Birkbeck.

We are witnessing the greatest war the world has ever known, truly a world war; and not one of us can be justified in thinking that the war does not concern him; that having no direct share in the struggle, he may look to his earthly welfare in quiet and comfort. On the contrary, the persistently utilitarian views of such opportunists are the most likely to meet with the greatest disappointment when the war is over, the bitterest consequences of the world-upheaval falling to their lot when nations group themselves anew, demanding other distributions of material resources. It is therefore the duty of us all to ascertain in advance what is the attitude of our innermost principles towards the grave problems which are being solved in this cruel and sanguinary contest.

We must not forget that the present war is not the result of any individual will or even the will of any separate nation. All contribute their typical peculiarities and are responsible in their degree in accordance with these; but none can be blamed in any direct way for the calamity itself. For this calamity is the result of a collision between different peoples on the common high-

* Translated by Vera Johnston.

way of universal motion, the conflict taking its present terrible form because those concerned failed to arrive at an understanding which would make it possible to separate in peace. And this is the precise point at which the combatants should be carefully examined and objectively appraised in order to arrive at a correct understanding of the present and a right apprehension of the future. Each of the struggling nations contributes that only which it naturally is, according to its ideals conditioning certain acts and producing certain tendencies. It is indisputable that Russia is one of the most important factors in the world conflict, and therefore it is meet that our dispassionate attention should be turned to the question, in what capacity it takes so prominent a part in the events, that without it the hegemony of the strong and the enslavement of the weak would have been established long ago, and a principle of mastery too far removed from the Gospel law would have been triumphant. Yet of all the combatants Russia is the least known in the West and so demands the most explanation.

Russia is fighting as an Orthodox country led by an Orthodox ruler for no confessional motives or gains, but because in Orthodoxy it has its being, is permeated by it, and faithfully upholds it. The part which Russia is taking in this world conflict can be best understood in the light of Orthodoxy. I have already had the opportunity of expressing the essence of Orthodoxy in the first number of this journal (pp. 282–305). It remains now for me to tell how Russia became Orthodox and has to this day remained "Holy Russia." With this object in view I offer a brief sketch of the Christian enlightenment of Russia through the medium of the Orthodox priesthood. The mission of this priesthood coincides with the objects of the Church itself and cannot be separated from it, for it is the Orthodox conviction that the mediation of a divinely established priesthood is necessary to the Christian renewal of our entire being and order. In the work

of regeneration Christianity binds each of us indissolubly to the Divine Redeemer, and through Him, as the Only Begotten Son of God, establishes our sonship to God the Father, so that becoming the children of God through grace, believers become indeed brothers. He who is endued with grace is joined unconditionally in the closest brotherly union to all the justified, because of the complete and actual equality of all in Christ.

In the Christian regeneration of humanity the individual and the social elements in their organic interdependence are fundamentally necessary and are seen in their normal development. From the beginning up to the present day the Orthodox Church of Russia has always worked along these lines—the individual and the general —through the medium of the clergy. In the human conscience, as the first approach, the Church raised the torch of Christ's radiance, enabling it to perceive and conquer darkness within and without. The mysterious process of the healing of the Christian soul by the operation of grace contributed from the first more than anything else to spiritual ascendency over heathen vanities, base human ideals of earthly prosperity and the despotic rule of arbitrary brutal force. Under the gloomy conditions of primitive Russia the Church, in the words of the renowned Professor Vasili Kluchevsky, made Death itself contribute to the upbuilding of communities in which charity was law, transforming a lawyer's office into a court of the Temple of God. This was accomplished by the transforming and uplifting of the individual. We shall mention only one concrete feature in the ancient history of Russia.

The Church took Russia into its fold at a time when, as the oldest of Russian annalists tells us, its people lived "in accordance with the habits of animals," of which habits they were not quite rid even as late as the twelfth century, judging by the *Questions of Kirik*, an ecclesiastical document of that century, in which Kirik the

Confessor submitted several questions for the decision of the Bishop of Novgorod. Utter carelessness concerning food was general. As is stated in one of the oldest manuscripts, bearing the name of St. John Chrysostom, the people "ate the leavings of the offerings to idols, also that which was strangled or mauled by beasts and torn by birds." The Church at once began to combat these "animal" propensities in a determined way, Elias Archbishop of Novgorod, in the twelfth century, insisting on compliance with the apostolic teaching that the people "abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication" (Acts 15:29). In his penitential directions he forbade unclean food of any kind, "the meat of squirrels, the meat of strangled animals in which there was blood, or the first milk of the cow after calving, or the flesh of bears, beavers, etc." All of this tends to show that gradually towards the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries considerable and lasting results must have been obtained on such points, and it is hardly possible to overestimate the importance of these results when we remember that they were the means of transforming a savage with "animal" propensities into an observer of Church rules, one trying to fulfil God's commandments, in fact, into a man whose life was that of a Christian in all its tendencies, moods and functions.

The building up of the life of the nation on canonical foundations was a great achievement. In the shelter of the Orthodox Church this was especially the work of the humble clergy, whose unceasing labours were devoted to the gradual reformation of every believer through the working of Christian influences. In the nature of things Christian relations later on became possible among the different peoples.

In its efforts to abolish the ancient rule of clan seclusion and animosity the Church in Russia established new forms of human intercourse in the intimate relationship of marriage, strengthening and consecrating a family life

which was built upon the new foundation of Christian ties in which all differentiation gradually disappears in the blending of souls. Naturally, as the sphere of the family attained new standards of nobility, the true calling and the glorious rule of woman acquired an inner dignity, the conception of a wife and a mother becoming imbued with a light of its own in everything which endears them to us and which they themselves hold dear, and this chiefly owing to the Church, its propaganda, and legislation. This again is the view of Professor Kluchevsky. In truth it is so, for in ancient Russia and even through many subsequent centuries, woman was held in contempt, she herself tenaciously clinging to heathen superstitions which she found it hard to give up. Under the influence of Byzantine ideals ascetic views at one time gained undue prominence in Russia; nevertheless, they were at all times the source that nourished and sustained the sense of the ideal purity of family relations, which in their most elementary functions are made here on earth to serve the ends of the Kingdom of God by creating those who become the children of God. It was, however, the white[1] clergy of Russia who preserved the stability of the family principle, upholding its sanctity by marrying but once, young widowers at times willing for its sake to go through trials of the most tragic kind. The clergy, being forbidden also to marry women of a different confession, have most completely preserved race purity.

Through the medium of the family the Church from the very first opposed every kind of separation, establishing unity in everything. In founding the new social order it tried to abolish the enslavement of serfs, by enforcing the Christian principle that all the people are equally "God's and the Czar's." The flotsam of life's wrecks

[1] Through custom's whim the monastic clergy who live in seclusion are called *black*, whereas the married clergy, living in the midst of their flocks and sharing their material conditions, are called *white*. The name contains no reference to any peculiarity of either, not even to the colour of their clothes.—V. J., Translator.

was also used by the Church for the building up of new social unions outside the existing classes of society. This was done for religious and moral purposes, as well as out of compassion and for charitable reasons, the clergy accepting the responsibility of "establishing law among the people who had learned about the Lord but recently," in the words of Hilarion, the first Metropolitan of Kieff (who died about 1054). In this was revealed the great mission of the Church in helping to build up the Russian polity. The holy Nestor, the historian (who died about 1114), recorded the fact of the blending of the various tribes of ancient Russia "into one tongue, being baptized into one Christ." On this foundation the Church attained to conditions which made it possible in the twelfth century for the godly prior Daniel, our very first pilgrim to the Holy Land, "with much rejoicing to burn an oil light at the Holy Sepulchre on behalf of the land of Russia." In the midst of the fratricidal struggles and intestine wars of the period between 860 and 1054, the power of the Church greatly weakened the fatal decentralizing tendencies of the small principalities and tribes by preaching the peace of Christ, thus laying a lasting foundation for outward union. No one can, of course, deny the participation of many political and other historical factors in this work. The "drawing together" of Russia, constituting the gradual civic and political unification of the ancient independent principalities around Moscow as the common centre, this city later becoming the capital of Russia, had been carried out successfully chiefly because the elements which were thus drawn together found a common source of vitality in the spiritual union, of which the general use of the same ecclesiastical Slavonic tongue was an outward sign, establishing the solidarity and the kinship of all under the shelter of the one Holy Mother Church. This was the one condition under which the visible conglomerate could possibly be shaped into a harmonious whole, a living, spiritualized, political organism. But without a

central governing body this seemed impossible because of its very nature, and so it is undeniable that it was the Church which indicated and consecrated autocracy, by which was created the great Russian Empire, strong in the power of God. During the recent sad days of internal strife (1905–1906) Russia attained to a peace which to a considerable extent was the work of the Christian influence of pastoral admonitions, calming the stormy impulses of the excited mob, and repressing the tendencies of ideologists and fanatics, who advocated another erection of the Tower of Babel.

In all this praiseworthy activity the clergy of Russia were never conspicuous personally, being absorbed in the general influence of the Church and completely sharing its general destinies. This is the strongest proof of the fact that the clergy never worked through the medium of their limited human abilities, but were guided in true Christian humility by the Divine Might which worked through their very lowliness. As Leroy-Beaulieu remarks with wonderful penetration, in Russian minds it is impossible to separate the idea of the Church from the idea of the country; and for this Russia is especially indebted to its priesthood, which has implanted this principle in the very heart of the Russian people. The Church has developed the civic sense in the people, and the work of the Church is made fruitful by its priesthood. Hence the importance of both the Church and its priesthood must inevitably stand out in clearer relief at critical periods of national existence.

Under the Mongol yoke of the Tartars (1223–1380) all that remained of Russian independence was centred in the rights of the Church, which guarded and nourished the hope of national regeneration, baptizing it to a better life on the battlefield of Kulikovo, where on September 8, 1380, Prince Dmitri Donskoy[2] destroyed Tartar ascen-

[2]So named because the great victory was won on the shore of the river Don.—V. J., Translator.

dency for ever. For the preceding century and a half the enslaved Russians had almost ceased to exist as a separate nation; they almost lost all faith in the very possibility of their political regeneration, yet with their indestructible essential characteristics they still lived in the bosom of the Orthodox Church, which continued to educate them for the coming triumph of regeneration. The memorable historian, Nicolai Karamzine, was more than right when he wrote that "during these two centuries, marked by the spirit of servility, . . . (the Christian faith) alone enabled us to maintain our place on the human level, preserving our civic sense, keeping our hearts from being petrified within us and our consciences from becoming mute for ever; in our humiliation as Russians we yet felt ourselves raised as Christians, and we loved our mother country as the land of the Orthodox faith."

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, during a period of terrible confusion within and without, when alien races of other creeds pressed Russia on all sides, and personal ambitions and hatred within increased the danger of complete destruction, the country was not completely exhausted by the invasions of foreigners simply because together with the inhabitants of Smolensk, the Russians never forgot the salutary confession: "Brothers, we are all of the same kin, because through baptism in the holy font we were born, promising to believe in the Holy and Undivided Trinity, knowing that God is living and that the Truth exists." It would be only just to ascribe the fact that the people remembered and were eventually awakened, to the activity of the clergy, in whom at this period, in the words of Nicolai Karamzine, "valour shone with unusual radiance." Of course the superior hierarchs and the monks were especially prominent, the latter led by the monks of the ancient cathedral of the Troitzky village in the Lavra of St. Serguey, near Moscow. But the share of the white clergy in all this activity is beyond doubt. In connection with the patriotic

proclamations and appeals issued by St. Dionysius, an archimandrite-prior of this Lavra, the name of a common priest, Ivan Nasedka, is also mentioned, the annals of the time informing us that for these two in their incessant work "every night was as day." As to the common masses who fought for the preservation of Russia, side by side with great leaders such as Liapunoff, Minine and Prince Pojarsky, they were inspired alone by the priests of their poor village churches. Another historian, Nicolai Kostomaroff, relates very impressively that during this cruel period of Russian history, "it was chiefly the clergy who fought the enemies of their faith and their country, and to the clergy chiefly belongs the credit for the fact that on the one hand the Orthodoxy of the Russians was preserved at that time, and on the other that Russia remained for ever free and self-dependent."

In its turn the Patriotic War (against Napoleon in 1812) terminated to the universal glory and profit of Russia, for when stricken to the very heart and on the point of losing Moscow, their ancient capital, the people did not lose their faith. In the Imperial manifesto of December 25, 1812, it was stated that the religion of Russia blended all "into one single soul, a courageous and righteous soul, ardent with as much love for its country as for its God." This victorious power of patriotic heroism drew its strength from the religious sources of the national spirit, which in its turn was nourished and cultivated by the humblest priests of the people.

The same we see today in the midst of the terrific smoke of the explosions of war and the trials of sword and blood. When their foes, proud of their exterior civilization, set in motion all the varied means and the most refined inventions for destruction, Russian warriors had nothing with which to oppose them but their indestructible moral valour, that valour which underground and in the air, on the water and under it, came from their offering of themselves as a Christian sacrifice for the sake of their outraged

country and the triumph of the justice of God on earth. Whence comes the miraculous potency of this humility if not from faith in Christ, implanted in them and strengthened by the labour of the worthy Orthodox pastors of Holy Russia? Who transforms a common peasant into an inspired hero if not the humble village "batushka" (a form of the word "father" which Russians use for their priests)? Who fostered in him the power to make such a glorious sacrifice of himself? In the heroic deeds of Russian soldiers we can feel the gentle but victorious guidance of the modest village priest, whose power is the living growth which, working through him, insures the might of the Russian nation. We are well aware of the fact that in the present war the chaplains of the Russian armies, eager to be of greater service to the soldiers, begged the leaders in charge to be informed of the expected battles and attacks at all the grave moments of military action. We are also aware of the results of their pastoral endeavours. In the summer of 1916 the Chairman of the State Council officially reported that the Russians "were led forward by the example of their fearless priesthood," who often sacrificed their lives like true warriors of Christ. The present is an object lesson teaching us what the past was. From it we learn by living examples the great Christian import of the educational activity of the Orthodox priesthood ever since the history of Russia began.

Of course, at first the dominant power lay with the ruling hierarchy, but to obtain the maximum results of its activity even that hierarchy had first to be truly national, on the same level as the parish priests. It should be generally acknowledged that all the superior edicts of the Church become living factors and spread throughout the length and breadth of Russia only through the unceasing labours of the rural clergy in their application of the vital precepts of Christ. Without this the guidance of the Church could only be a sort of sublime preaching; whereas

true Christianity is the vital action of the quickening Divine Grace on every human personality. The share of the monasteries in the civilizing influences on Russia must not be forgotten, but, even when achieving their work by martyrdom, the monasteries were always the conservers of Christian energy, while its embodiment in the hearts of the Russian people has to this day been accomplished by the work of the humble white clergy, whose fruitful service is truly holy. In this respect the Russian priesthood should most emphatically be given the credit for the development of the inner affinity between the Gospel and the soul of the Russian nation by implanting in that nation and grafting it with the spirit of Orthodoxy. Foreigners like Leroy-Beaulieu have noted this. Nestor, the ancient writer of the first Russian annals, greeted it as "the bright dawn of Russia's felicity." Nicolai Gogol, the great recorder of Russian manners and customs, said that "the Church . . . seems to have been brought down for the Russian people straight from heaven," and Feodor Dostoevsky said that the Russian people came to be so closely united with the Orthodox Church that through it "Christ and His teaching were received into its very being." In all this the part of the clergy was most important. They have always been in touch with the conscience of the people, grafting into it the principles of faith, hope and charity. Their everyday life is inseparable from that of the people, which makes it possible for them to assist in the civic progress of the nation and to safeguard its independence at times of cruel historical trial. During the rebellion of the Poles in the sixth decade of the nineteenth century the clergy protected the rights of the Russians, with whom they identified themselves. When on February 19, 1861, by a manifesto of Alexander II, the serfs were emancipated, this being accompanied by many complications, priests were the peacemakers who successfully guarded the birth and growth of the people's freedom. To the priests belongs the initiative in the or-

ganized struggle against the horror of drunkenness among the people, and to them belongs too the credit for progress in sobriety. In the middle of the nineteenth century it was the custom of the government to lease the monopoly of the liquor trade to private individuals, who were often unscrupulous in the pursuit of material gains. At the time when the chief Curator of the Holy Synod announced in an Imperial circular that "a complete prohibition of intoxicating drinks by means of religious threats (on the part of the priests) and of the taking of a pledge (on the part of the common people), strongly affecting the popular mind, should not be allowed," the priests were raising their voices against this terrible evil in spite of all the power of those enjoying the monopoly.

Of course these long years of service of the priesthood could not be altogether without their flaws. But we are too apt to exaggerate the faults and weaknesses of the priestly class, without discerning between the defects which those accused can remedy and those which lie beyond their power, and for which the accusers should be held responsible. I shall not deny any accusation; I shall not dispute anybody's statement; I shall merely repeat what a great Russian layman, the late Constantine Pobedonostzeff, said in 1888 at the Kieff celebration of the nine hundredth anniversary of the conversion and baptism of Russia. He said: "A man who knows the hardships in the midst of which the Russian clergy, especially the village clergy, spend their lives and work, will repress any accusing word against the guilty, awestruck by the greatness of the achievements of the many, who labour obscurely in the midst of the waste lands, the forests and the marshes of our boundless Russia, suffering from cold and hunger, bearing great privations and not uncommonly great abuse. Legions of these workers already stand in the presence of God interceding for us; our Church is built on their dead bones. But what a great number of those who live in our day are working like those who

went before for the upbuilding of our Church! Glory and honour to the Russian priesthood! May the grace of God increase their great power of faith, their feeling of love and pity, to help them to teach by word and precept!"

Such is the objective truth as to the position and value of the clergy of Orthodox Russia. Only last summer (in July, 1916) a bishop of the Anglican Church asked the people of Russia: "Do you sufficiently appreciate your incomparable clergy?"

The facts I have mentioned and my comments may make my readers wonder if clericalism really rules in Russia. Any supposition of this kind is entirely false, for facts flatly contradict it. This is sufficiently proved by the unfortunate dependence of our hierarchy on the State. As to the white clergy, their usefulness to the laity is easily overlooked, but the inferiority of their social position and their material destitution bear witness to the falseness of such a supposition.

The famous Metropolitan Philaretes, who died in 1867, was right when he maintained that "ever since Christianity was adopted in Russia up to the present day our people have never had any teachers but the clergy—the servants of the Orthodox Church, whose mouthpiece they were. A spiritual father examining his flock, teaching them in the church, consecrating them by the sacraments, praying with them on all solemn occasions, participating most intimately in all their sorrows and joys, is and always was the most befitting teacher and master of the village school. The clergy have sufficiently vindicated their right to be called the teachers of the people; the history of Russia is their best testimonial. The nation has gone through the miseries of incessant intestine wars waged by small principalities for ambitious purposes, it has suffered from the Tartar yoke, from the crafty pretenders to the heritage of Moscow, from the wars with the Swedes, the Poles, and later with the French; the

people magnanimously submitted to the abrupt reforms of Peter the Great and won the admiration of all observers by their amazing self-control after the manifesto of February 19, 1861, was made known to the masses (concerning their emancipation and the new regulations). In all this during more than nine centuries, the people had but one school—the Orthodox Church, but one guide—the Orthodox priesthood."

Such was the original source from which came all the formative and educational influences in the life of the nation, from which are still fed great numbers of people in the remotest corners of the Russian dominions. Yet the clergy by no means dominate educational spheres, taking no exclusive charge of any branches therein, but merely spiritualizing their tendencies where possible. Raising the dignity of the Christian individuality of all men, and their moral tone, the clergy more than any other class helped in equalizing the privileges among all classes, though "the sad walk of humility and humiliation fell to their own share," in the words of Peter Znamensky, who authoritatively states that to this day the clergy's material position is bitter and their future prospects not alluring.

The civic destitution of the priestly class was so customary and seemed so normal that even under Catherine the Great (1762–1796) and later the members of that class, not taking holy orders, had few chances open to them, being only allowed to enter the lower middle-class or to descend to the level of peasants or enlist as soldiers. Not until the reign of Alexander I at the beginning of the nineteenth century were the priests and their families raised above the "servile masses." Even to this day the priesthood of Russia is so far from having any domineering tendencies that there can be absolutely no possibility of clericalism. On the contrary, the most intimate bond which unites the clergy to the people is so indisputable that we may unhesitatingly say that the priests are not

only the spiritual guides of the people but also the best interpreters of the national genius in general. The Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, M.A., not very kindly remarks that "Russia is only now emerging from the Middle Ages," and Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D., a little disparagingly adds to this that "the religious basis of Russia is Byzantine to this day." But it follows from these statements only that in its essence Russia firmly stands on the original foundation and bases its spiritual life on the dominant factors of bygone days. As in times past these factors are still the Christian principles which were implanted in Russia by its Orthodox clergy, who still guard them. Sheltering many tribes and races, permitting many creeds to exist peacefully side by side, Russia is in spirit an Orthodox country. Therefore the part it is taking in the world strife can be understood and defined only in strict consideration of this primary factor, which is the decisive stimulus in all its activity. Everyone has to decide what his opinion should be concerning the true reasons and motives of our country in the present war. But in sorrowful days of military defeat as well as in brighter days of rejoicing for victories the Russian Church prays equally on behalf of all mankind: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men."

Our Spiritual Peril as Neutrals

By the Archbishop of Upsala.

In some particular form self-righteousness lies in wait for all of us in the neutral countries and pervades us. I should not insist so urgently if I had not personally felt the creeping danger which here lurks round our moral health. Precisely as the Saviour detested above all else the pharisaic temper, so the verdict of Christianity must brand the complaisant superiority of would-be morality among us neutrals. In the midst of us, too, a self-assumed authority is being exercised as if we were the moral judges of the universe.

At the outbreak of the war our agonized cry was: "Woe to those who desired the war." If in any eyes the war took on a glamour of romance, it must have been sadly sullied by the ensuing streams of blood shed. Glorification of war now wears the aspect of bitter mockery. But who, for all that, can sit in judgment? Only of course those who know to a nicety on whom to cast the guilt of this fathomless misery. They too can set it all right and usher in peace as easily as they can wave their hand. For well-meaning bodies such as these the war has no grandeur; it is hideous, brutal, bloody, murderous. To these the greatest good, the grandest and most sovereign thing on earth is this poor human life.

But it may be assumed that there is something more valuable than this mortal existence. It matters little if our earthly life extends a few days or a half score years less or more. The gist of the thing is *how*, or for *what*, we spend our lives. We appreciate this; and yet at the same moment, war in general, and this one in particular (with

its present devilry of technical perfection, and its millions of belligerents), is of such a nature as to stagger the mind; and human feeling cannot desist for a moment from groping, however blindly—after something to end the slaughter.

If the heart is probed, and superficial phrases and mannerisms are not too closely cherished, the present fault of neutral pharisees is that we keep at a distinguished distance from affliction. We possibly relish, with or without prejudice, a lofty indifference. But times like these allow of no such exquisite enjoyment. Neutral self-righteousness does assign blame. And no doubt we reserve to ourselves the right of independent judgment. Yet in this tragedy none of us is an arbiter, but all are participants, be we in affliction or no. Much has been said of the self-righteousness of belligerents, and that may well enough be astounding. But it is high time for us to speak of pharisaism among ourselves, us neutrals. That touches us to the quick.

This self-righteousness offends twice over against the Christ-spirit. It refuses to fathom actual facts, and it has no genuine love. There is a hesitancy about taking in good earnest the horror now prevailing in the world. Blind man's buff is being played with realities. The fire is not felt even while it scorches the face, and it is counted a downright advantage to throw dust in each other's eyes. Necessity and suffering in the world have never been appreciably mitigated by anyone who, because of incapacity or moral cowardice, counted them secondary. The brightest Revelation of Love implanted in our humanity a new Love, and declared a fresh war on human need. He never reckoned suffering as of slight importance. He went through pitiless pain and death; nothing is gained by pretending that war is only a malevolent accident.

In the Institut de France on June 10, 1916, the distinguished French economist, Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, opposed the popular idea that war is an anachronism. He drew

attention to the numerous wars during the last forty years by Russia, England, Japan, Italy, the United States, the Balkan States and other powers. Some of the wars had indeed a very definite purpose, e.g., the conquest of certain colonies or other possessions. But war in the modern sense, as connected with a higher development of national life, has a much more formidable and thoroughgoing aspect; firstly, because it does not confine itself to any such special aims, but it constitutes, when statesmanship fails, an acute and desperate form of competition of the vital energies of the nations. And secondly, war in the modern sense is not a business executed with hired armies, but the democratic institution of full civic responsibility engages the whole of the nation in the conflict. It may be that war in this modern sense has a closer connection with our civilization than we would like to think. This glorious civilization of ours believed it was being carried by a kind of intrinsic necessity very smoothly into paradise until it found itself at the side of hell or in hell. Our thinking must not take by-paths. We must face this spectre of human need and hard conditions eye to eye. Faith solves no problems by avoiding them.

Besides our other blessings some of us in the neutral countries have been favoured more than most other peoples with a long period of peace. At present our peoples, at least in Europe, are more and more tormented by the effects of the war. But up till now, the neutrals, all of us, have escaped being drawn into the still worse suffering under which our brethren in other countries groan. This fact implies responsibilities, but it is no reason for arrogance. What befits us is not lofty moral airs, but honourable self-examination and the narrow path of duty. For upon us neutrals too the judgment day of our moral trial is coming. Nay, it is already at hand.

Is my foreboding true? Stern voices are now loud in rivalry. When once the day dawns after what is now being

enacted, these voices will perhaps in common address themselves to us neutrals. I surmise that, if continuous peace is vouchsafed to us, their thankfulness for our exemption will be more universal than it now is. They will be glad that some corners of Europe were left outside the battlefields and the enemy country.

But what will they say to us on the day when peace is at last concluded? I do not speak of those who join in the concert of misrepresentation and hatred or are even ambitious of taking a leading part in that awful chorus. Those are to be pitied whose limited knowledge or want of moral force does not allow them to take, I do not say a just, but a tolerably dignified, view of their enemies. There are other voices.

"No Church should forget the Lord's prayer: 'That they all may be one.' This implies that we must not in mutual indifference each go his own way. We must be prepared to serve each other in everything possible. We must also be prepared to unite bonds that have been broken. If and when the opportunity for doing so will present itself we cannot decide, nor fix the time for its coming. We must wait till God opens the door. And as to ourselves, we can only be prepared to do the right thing at the right moment." With these words Professor Albert Hauck of Leipzig, the great historian of the Church in Germany, ended his lectures, held during October last in the University of Upsala, on the relations of England and Germany in ecclesiastical history. And there still resound in my ears the noble words of the French tradesman: "It may be that having fought each other in this way we may afterwards understand each other better than before."

The Challenge, Deissmann's *Weekly Letters* and other writings uphold, notwithstanding the war, a sense of the universality of Christianity. Was it the Bishop of Oxford who said that Englishmen and Germans will after the war have much to forgive each other?

A year ago I read about a new ending that an increasing number of German regiments had adopted for their "Die Wacht am Rhein." Instead of "Lieb Vaterland, magst ruhig sein" they sing:

> "We fear not, we hesitate not,
> We fight faithfully, as our duty,
> Until God gives the verdict
> When He judges the world."

Where such a mood constrains to the faithful fulfilment of even the hardest duties, while recognizing the short view of mankind and leaving the ultimate judgment to God, there also a sense of communion in suffering and trial may be experienced or come into existence.[1] How will such a feeling manifest itself toward the neutral nations? A French scholar told me his astonishment when a lady in a neutral country lamented over their sufferings from the war. He asked: "*Madame, vous avez donc perdu vos fils? Ou bien, votre mari est-il mutilé?*"

I may be right in anticipating that the moral instincts of nations previously at war will turn as one man upon us neutrals with the reproach: "Why were you so self-righteous while we were plunged in need?"

In either case I am not deaf to another voice, that of Christ, when His disciples, in the face of visitation, came to him with the explanations of the Pharisees. Are the belligerents worse beings than we neutrals? This is

[1] In this connection it may be of interest to mention the remarkable clause in the ancient Swedish prayer for time of war printed in the Hymn Book of 1695 and used in the seventeenth century in the wars of Charles XII and later: "If the cause for which we fight is just—*and we know naught else.*" After a prelude about King David and Goliath etc., the prayer runs: "O great and merciful God, peradventure the cause for which we fight is just (and we know naught else), we beseech Thee that Thou wouldst turn the hearts of our enemies to peace, in order that so much Christian blood may not be shed; or smite Thou them with unexpected terror and thereby graciously vouchsafe unto us a merciful victory, with small bloodshed and harm, that this war being speedily ended, we may sing our triumph song, to Thy praise and glory, Who ever rulest and reignest over all things, the one Almighty Lord. Amen."

explicitly or by implication taken for granted by the self-righteous in neutral lands. "Nay," answereth the Christ, "except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." God, Who is able to turn disaster itself to gain, will one day grant us—maybe, maybe—to know something of the Saviour's other words touching affliction: "This cometh to pass that the works of God may be made manifest."

Certain it is that God will ruthlessly tear off the wrappings of pharisaism—be they fine or coarse. Let us rather do so ourselves by His help. Let us not sit on the judgment seat uninvited; but acknowledge our share of guilt in the failures of this bewildered and criminal world. If love is our guide, and not the pharisee spirit more or less conscious, and if the prayer for peace is kindled in our hearts, let us henceforth rally with the earnest desire, that inspired statesmen, who are able and daring enough to see the truth, may soon initiate an interchange of peace thoughts. May God cleanse our hearts from the self-righteousness that besets us all! May we draw nigh to the Lord with penitent hearts! That will give a new force to our ardent intercession for peace.

Neutral pharisaism is nothing but an expression of temper that contributes weakness to Christianity. In contrast to Christ we hesitate to concern ourselves with the brutal and shocking distress of humanity, and we are tempted to suppose ourselves to rise superior to those who are sunk in such a brutal and offensive state of distress.

Mysticism in the French Church*

By W. L. Bevan

What is the explanation of the deepening interest in mysticism which prevails everywhere today? This interest transcends all existing divisions among Christians. Mysticism is not a faculty of the religious life which belongs as a peculiar possession to any communion of Christians. In a certain sense the mystic finds himself at home wherever the name of Christ is reverenced. Various causes have contributed to bring about this result. The study of psychology cannot be neglected. Speculative philosophy is no longer regarded as the peculiar instrument of religious investigation. There is a humbler task which must be regarded as of primary importance. How does the mind of man act in its present environment? There is something more than the processes of sensation, something more than perceptions based upon these processes. In this "something more" we know that the mind of man has from the first attempted at least to grasp realities beyond the limits of his own nature. This is the field which the interpreters of mysticism rightly claim as the subject of their investigation. It is a field which must be approached sympathetically; and such a sympathetic treatment is only possible for those who have carefully studied the phenomena of the religious life. Personal records of an intimate character are the only sources that can be drawn upon. Purely intellectual gifts are not

**Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours.* By Henri Bremond. Vol. I. *Humanisme dévot;* Vol. II. *L'invasion mystique.* (Paris: Bloud et Gay).

sufficient in a task of this delicacy; and whenever a writer undertakes to explore the field of mysticism, one is bound to examine into the character of his credentials before following him as a guide.

In answering these demands no contemporary writer has a better claim than Bremond, who has just published the two initial volumes of an extensive work which will take up the history of the mystical elements in the religious life of France, from the time of the Reformation down to our own day. Bremond has shown remarkable gifts of psychological analysis in his books on Newman and on the subordinate figures of the Oxford Movement. He has the true sense of mystical values, because he has shown the capacity to get behind the purely temporary manifestations of religious life and ecclesiastical controversy and sound the depths of man's spiritual consciousness in the sphere where religious verities make their common appeal. He realizes to the full the significance that attaches itself to the axiom of Cardinal Newman, "*Cor ad cor loquitur*," and in his own presentation of the development of the religious consciousness he uses the media of realistic analysis which represent today, where human nature is concerned, the most successful achievements in the investigation of the steps by which man's relationship to God has been established and plotted out.

Probably the best avenue to the understanding of the mystical point of view in religion may be found in a passage of William James' *Psychology*, which sets forth in plain and unadorned language the scientific residuum of prayer. He says: "We hear in these days of scientific enlightenment a great deal of discussion about the efficacy of prayer; and many reasons are given us why we should not pray. But in all this very little is said of the reason why we do pray, which is simply that we cannot help praying. It seems probable that, in spite of all that Science may do to the contrary, men will continue to pray to the end of time, unless their mental nature

changes in a manner which nothing we know should lead us to expect. The impulse to pray is a necessary consequence of the fact that whilst the innermost of the empirical selves of a man is a self of the social sort, it yet can find its only adequate *socius* (its great companion) in an ideal world of suspension points. Most men, either continually or occasionally, carry a reference to it in their breasts. The humblest outcast on this earth can feel himself to be real and valid by means of this higher recognition. And, on the other hand, for most of us, a world with no such inner refuge when the outer social self failed and dropped from us would be the abyss of horror. I say for most of us, because it is probable that men differ a good deal in the degree in which they are haunted by the sense of an ideal spectator. It is a much more essential part of the consciousness of some men than of others. Those who have the most of it are possibly the most religious men. But I am sure that even those who say they are altogether without it, deceive themselves, and really have it in some degree."

There are several factors in this quotation which the student of mysticism can hardly fail to emphasize. It is true that the mystics as a class must be regarded as the spiritually *élite* in the practice of a life of essential religion. Only the immediate sense of God's presence can form the basis of essential religion, and without such sense religion becomes to a certain extent a derivative and artificial relationship with God. The mystics represent the type of personality that both by instinct and training practises the immediate sense of God's presence. It is perfectly true that Christian mysticism has its affinities with the mysticism practised by the Neoplatonic School of Philosophy, but it cannot be said that historically Christian mysticism originated with Plotinus and his followers. There is in the words of Jesus recorded in the Gospel and also in the writings of St. John and St. Paul a broad recognition of the mystical element in religion. When

we remember the definite purpose that predominates in the writings of the New Testament, that is, after we have thrown aside, as one must throw aside through the results of scholarly investigation, the old theory that the whole of early Christianity must be looked for and can be found within the pages of the New Testament and nowhere else, we cannot escape the conviction that the mystical suggestions in the New Testament point to a broad foundation of mystical experience in the early Christian community.

How large a part the mystical tradition assumed in the ordinary point of view of the leaders of the early church may be seen in the letters of St. Ignatius. St. Ignatius, be it remembered, was no religious genius; he was far from being a man of exceptional power. No one could claim that he originated anything either in the way of Christian doctrine or Christian expression of doctrine. The words of St. Ignatius as found in his letters bear witness to a tradition which he shared in common with the other members of the Christian community. The unsystematic form which Christian mysticism takes in the letters of St. Ignatius does not at all diminish the importance which this element of religious life assumed in the early community. All of the tenets of the church, the primary as well as the subordinate ones, were alike presented without the formalism that comes from philosophic reflection. It would be impossible to draw up any scheme of mystical religion from the letters of St. Ignatius, and there is no evidence that mysticism had gone through any advancing stages of development in the period between the composition of the books in the New Testament and the composition of the letters of St. Ignatius.

All that is contended for is that from the very first, long before the days when Christian experience began to accept something of the schematic formalism of Neoplatonic philosophy, Christian teaching was essentially and also instinctively mystical. It might be very fairly said

that long before the purely intellectual formulation of the Christian faith in the shape of creeds and in the discussions of apologists and teachers the mystical element that comes directly from the original soil of the Gospel was consciously and directly the basis of Christian life, Christian conviction and Christian character. This historical evidence entirely harmonizes with the investigations that have been made in recent years in the field of the psychology of religion. The more the data of religion are studied the more clear it is that all religion is ultimately based upon personal experience. Dogmas and doctrines could find no receptive hold in man's consciousness unless there was an area of this consciousness that at least to a certain degree made possible the realization of God's presence.

To treat mysticism as a novel and superadded element in the Christian religion is a mistake not simply from the historical point of view; it is equally a mistake from the point of view of those who have examined the common and general basis of religion as it has manifested itself in all the phases of man's development. Let us hear what Prof. Rufus Jones says on this point in an essay contributed to Canon Streeter's book *Concerning Prayer*, in which he gives the measured conclusion of his own painstaking investigations into the field of the mystic apperception of religious truth:

"My studies of mysticism," Professor Jones says, "have gradually led me to the view that religion is essentially and at bottom a mystical act, a direct way of vital intercourse between man and God. Religion is thus in its essential features as genuinely a matter of experience as is our relationship with an external world. This interior experience of relationship with invisible reality is what I mean by 'mystic vision.' The experience of mystic vision is one in which life appears at its highest level of inner unity and integral wholeness. . . . There is something in the structure of the soul, in the nature of personal self-consciousness, which prepares the way for mystic vision

and which fits us for the type of experience above described."

For ages the poets have realized the possibility and the actuality of this experience. The highest flights of their poetical expression and intuition can alone be explained upon the possibility of the interchange between what we know as human personality and what we suspect is divine personality. Of course when one says divine personality there is here only an adumbration of something real beyond and above human nature, based upon the *terra incognita* of human nature itself. There is something not ourselves in our own nature, with which we can come in contact, and the very fact that our own nature comprises something indefinable, something illimitable, brings to us the conviction that in the sphere of consciousness we can in a way know the presence of a power that transcends the limits of man's own faculties and possibilities. It is this consciousness of something beyond the personal *ego* in its ordinary attainments and capacities that has induced such a man as Maeterlinck, who has little sympathy with historical Christianity, to declare that "there is in us above the reasoning portion of our reason a whole region answering to something different which is preparing for the surprises of the future and which goes on ahead of our imperfect attainments and enables us to live on a level very much superior to that of those attainments."

One must go back to the divisions established so carefully and so moderately by the philosopher Kant, who in mapping out the faculties of man's self-consciousness left a large place for aesthetic appreciation. The ability to know and recognize the beautiful in nature and in the plastic arts shows how in the field of religious life the recipient comes to know God as the immediate object of consciousness. Of course one must recognize in both these cases that the use of the term knowledge is purely tentative. We cannot know the beautiful in the sense in which we know a proposition in geometry or in which we

analyze a law of physics. So when we ask the mystic to state in plain language the results of his own experience of personal intercourse with God we are putting him to a test both unreasonable and unfair, in fact the kind of test which we would not think of imposing at all had it not been that through the organized systems of religion one has become accustomed to limit religious knowledge to the kind of knowledge which can be expressed and made intellectually understandable in the traditional propositions of a faith expressed in dogmatic statements.

No study of mysticism can be successfully originated and no study of mysticism can be in an especial sense related with the primary convictions of the Christian faith itself as revealed in the teaching of Jesus and in the common expression of that teaching in the primitive Church, unless these principles are plainly declared from the outset and given their proper value. If they are not accorded this proper value that belongs to them in the origins of Christianity, and because of their intimate relationship with the religious consciousness of man at all times and everywhere, one might suppose that the manifestations of mysticism in any age and in any country were something extraordinary or abnormal. As a matter of fact religion without mysticism would be an abnormality. Since the Christian faith rests upon mystical assumptions and presuppositions one is really bound to commence with these presuppositions and assumptions and not find in them the resultants of something assumed to have been, apart from them, the original expression of the Gospel message as delivered by Jesus to His apostles.

Every word of our Lord's, every parable, every development of His teaching, every act in His benevolent care for the suffering of humanity has ultimately a background of mystical conviction. It is easy for those who lose themselves in the details of Jewish apocalyptic, or who see in the ministry of our Lord only a realistic treatment of the events of His own time and the experiences of His own

ministry from the point of view of a narrow eschatology, to forget that the impulse of mysticism is varied and by no means uniform. A man of action can be a mystic just as well as a recluse, and mysticism may show its potency in the dynamic energy of a great religious leader who sees the needs of the moment and acts upon them, as well as in the isolated routine of the recluse.

It is necessary to make these distinctions, to establish these justifications for the mystical element in the religious consciousness of mankind, before we can approach with any degree of sympathy or understanding the manifestations of the life of religious mystics in any age and in any country. If a mystic is in visible sympathy with any type of organized religion the character so endowed with a sensitive and keen perception of God's presence does not need to become an outlaw before superior stages of development are reached. Essentially the religion of the mystic is not a religion of revolt. It is a religion which accepts the accidents of environment; which reconciles the weak elements of the visible world with the strong realities of the spiritual life. It sweeps over man's inner being and enables him in the light of the sense of God's presence to estimate the relative values of all of those things that belong to religious experience as a whole.

One has only to think of trying to apply the test of a specifically detailed orthodoxy to the great leaders of mysticism. Such an application, the moment it is attempted, seems absurd and out of place. The mystics stand outside and beyond the atmosphere of theological controversy and ecclesiastical politics. Would it be possible to say that Thomas à Kempis would be more helpful to the individual soul if we knew what position he took toward the questions at issue that were debated in the councils of the fifteenth century? He may have sympathized with the Council of Basel or he may have been a devoted partisan of Pope Martin and Pope Nicholas. We are no more concerned with his ecclesiastical sympa-

thies than we are with the individual and personal sympathies of a great poet or a great painter. His work rests upon a different foundation; it makes a different appeal. We do not ask whether Michael Angelo approved of the moral derelictions of Alexander VI, or whether his testimony can be adduced against the activities of the German reformers. All such questions as these are dismissed when we confront his works in their terrible simplicity; in their primitive appeal to man's aesthetic capacities.

So with the mystic; we ask, in what degree, in what form does his experience reveal to us his knowledge of the immediate Presence of God as the direct object of his personal life. No matter where mysticism is found it is possible to have these questions answered. Of all the developments of religion mysticism is the freest from local and ecclesiastical limitations. If this were not so, it would be impossible to explain the general acceptance of such a book as the *Imitation of Christ* as a devotional manual.

One must free oneself from the prejudices of sectarian training with its narrow appreciation of the mystics if we wish to reach the level on which they themselves stand. Only by such a process of purification from prejudice can the Roman Catholic student of mysticism understand the content of the religious experience of the Protestant mystic, and perhaps it is even harder for the Protestant student of mysticism to give an adequate valuation of the phraseology and the realms of devotional thought that are the peculiar media of the Roman Catholic mystic. We are glad to see that Bremond does not neglect to notice the connecting link which binds together mystics of every name and of all affiliations. In his preliminary notes to the first volume of his work on *Religious Sentiment in France* he allows that no complete picture can be given of the seventeenth century devotee (*religieux*) without the study of the Protestant Mystics. He especi-

ally expresses his regret because light would have been thrown on his own narrative if he could have added some chapters on the history of the Anglican Church. "Provided," he says, "I had been more learned and had had more space at my command I should have liked to show a movement among Anglicans of the first half of the seventeenth century analogous to our own religious humanism and the distant precursor of the Oxford Movement. I should have liked to show, too, that the influence of our authors and notably Francis of Sales made itself felt on the other side of the Channel."

One touch of mysticism makes the whole religious world kin. Can one wonder, therefore, that at a time when the vision opening up towards Christian reunion is becoming more clarified there has been a remarkable revival of interest in the Christian mystics generally? To understand the mystics is to promote an understanding among Christians of every name. It is for this reason that the kind of intimate spiritual biography presented in Bremond's volumes is certain to be helpful and directive. A striking passage is quoted from Grandmaison's book on *Personal Religion*, that estimates in broad touches the position held by the great mystics in the history of religious development. "As they are presented to us in history—these whom the life of mysticism has set apart from their brethren to make them if not always more holy at least more advanced in the pathway of union culminating in the beatific vision of the Presence of God —these privileged ones offer lessons by which all can profit. The experiences of these heralds, of these lost children of our race, bent towards attaining the supreme good without imperfection, these experiences remain for us set down by them just as records brought back by explorers from almost inaccessible lands. The great mystics are the pioneers, the heroes of the most beautiful, the most desirable and most marvellous of worlds. Beside this, for all of those who, while trying to develop their personal

religion, are gropingly seeking for their Creator in the aridity of their daily tasks, the mystics are in their place and order witnesses. After the great Witness who has revealed the Father, after the Apostles and the martyrs, the great mystics, duly remembering every proportion and every difference, can say what the Beloved Disciple said: 'That which we have seen, that which we have heard, that which our hands have handled, we announce to you.' And while we are hearing them deliver this message our soul is shaken with hope and expectation. They are in this way the witnesses of God's Presence as the friend of humanity."

This fine passage reveals the strength of the appeal that comes to the religious consciousness from the example of Mysticism, but the appeal cannot be appreciated or even in a measure understood without considerable effort on our part. The appeal is an educated one and any kind of education implies active and continuous effort. The evidence presented in Bremond's volumes shows clearly enough that the teachings and the examples of the mystics, so sympathetically handled in his pages, are as nothing from the popular point of view compared with the attractiveness of new cults and the watchwords of clerical partisanship. Most of the names recorded in Bremond's pages have faded from the memory of those who are loyal to the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church in France itself. This group of men and women of a high spiritual potency have become mere names even in the religious orders which owed so much to them during their lifetime.

To vitalize their teaching, to place it in a medium in which it can be generally understood among other people and in other ages, is no easy task. Bremond's work is evidently a labour of love, but it was no easy work for the commentator, the critic, the intermediary who is endowed with all of the gifts literary and analytical of the trained French writer. Oftentimes Bremond must himself have

felt the strangeness of his task in bringing back these evanescent touches of the spiritual life, illuminated by the wayward intangibility of the experience of the mystic. No kind of system or classification is possible.

The mysticism of France in the period described by Bremond appears to have been a field of almost unlimited liberty. Mystics had no school in the ordinary sense; they came under, it is true, certain definite influences radiating from their personalities, but it would be an incongruous and untrue effort to discuss Mysticism under the forms of scholastic thought. Even those loyal to the dogmatic confessional documents of the sixteenth century would find themselves completely at a loss if they undertook to arrange the experiences of Mysticism in the form of Articles of the Faith. Bremond's own method is to follow the lines of personal biography. He recognizes the elasticity and intangibility of his subject by declining to introduce into his text any formal treatment. As far as possible the mystics are allowed to speak for themselves. Bremond's work is to explain their meaning to his readers, and his purpose is to bring readers into sympathetic relation with various groups of mystics.

At the close of the second volume a few pages are added in which mysticism as a religious phenomenon is discussed. Here we have compressed into an outline what might be a complete treatise on the subject; there is no attempt made to bring the principles in close relation with the various personalities who form the subject matter of the eleven hundred pages of the first two volumes of Bremond's work. In the mystical state, Bremond says, "we have the direct sentiment of God's Presence." In other words the mystic receives an intellectual knowledge of this presence of an experimental character. The manifestations of ecstasy, the suspension of the organs of sense, sensational or visual images, auditory phenomena, levitations, second sight, are purely accessory details. The feeling of the immediate presence of a trans-

cendant being is the central factor in Mysticism. No matter what may be its form the same experience underlies the various fashions in which it may be expressed.

Mystics are neither frauds nor visionaries. The difference of the witnesses makes no difference in the unity of the record. In all the manifestations of Mysticism it is recognized that only an approximation can be given under the limitations of such an intellectualized medium as language of the original intuitional experience. In place of a dry common-place type of abstract knowledge, we find substituted for it something resembling immediate evidence imposed from without that cannot be described in argumentative forms. The force of the impression explains why mystics relate their experience in the most striking language, sometimes so striking that the phraseology appears artificial and unconvincing. Metaphors drawn from the processes of sensation are usual simply because sensational processes have an unusually primitive strain. If the feeling of immediate presence is not to be found, mystic contemplation is not known. Mystical experience is always the active not the symbolic presentation of God to the soul. This has its physiological corollate, the immediate intuition of God by the soul. This immediate intuition is spoken of by the mystics in very different ways. Some call it contemplation, others prayer, others mystical knowledge, others mystical union, some ecstasy.

Ecstasy is the word preferred by Bremond. Mystical experiences must be definitely differentiated from such visions as those experienced by Joan of Arc or the phenomena that accompanied the appearances at Lourdes. St. Theresa distinguished clearly these two forms of experience with which she was perfectly familiar in her own religious life. Visions by themselves have nothing to do with the essence of mysticism, they are purely secondary. They can aid the life of a mystic, but they stand on a lower level than mystical intuition of a pure type. Very often mystical contemplation is accompanied by corporal and mental

phenomena. The ordinary powers of the body are suspended for the time being, imagination, memory and intelligence lose their activity, the whole life is concentrated on the point of contact between spirit and spirit. These phenomena have often been made the essential factor in the mystical state, but so far from being a special achievement they are a tribute paid by the mystic to human weakness. Somatic phenomena are not given in Bremond's narrative any special place.

When the word knowledge is used in connection with mysticism it must be remembered that we are using the term in a new sense. Students of Bergson are perfectly familiar with his depreciation of formal knowledge and his insistence upon the kind of knowledge that comes through intuitional processes. In the same way the knowledge of God attained in mysticism is much more complete, much more adequate than any knowledge of Him that can come through a series of affirmations or negations. The grasp attained by the mystic is the highest type of grasp, but it lays hold of the truth rather than truths, of the light rather than lights, of a presence rather than a doctrine. We cannot criticize the mystical type of knowledge unless we share it, because both criticism and intellectual formulation of this knowledge are out of place. We know nothing of it apart from what we have been told by the mystics themselves. It is the duty of the interpreter of the mystic to accept with facility what has been told us and it is our business to explain the confidences of the only experimenters who have revealed to us this mysterious method of knowledge.

"If in seeing God," the great original Christian authority on mysticism pseudo-Dionysius says, "one understands that one sees Him, that is not God which has been the object of contemplation but some one of the things which proceed from Him and which we are able to know." The same point of view is presented in St. John of the Cross in the following passage: "Contemplation only gives a

general and obscure knowledge by means of which the understanding does not attain to know distinctly that which has been presented." The analogy with the central position of Bergson's system is very clear here. In both cases we see the inability to present the object of intuition in the forms of the intellectual processes. We see here too how impossible it is for the theological deposit of the faith to receive any accretions through the experiences of mysticism. Inspiration in the sacred writings is something entirely different from the contemplations received by the mystic in a state of ecstasy. Perhaps the inspired author might be considered a human medium through which the content of contemplation received by the mystic may be transformed into the categories of the intellect.

Mysticism is not synonymous with genius; numbers of mediocre characters have showed a capacity to receive the special grace of the mystic. When they undertake to write down their experiences they not infrequently bore us and sometimes they shock us with the language employed by them. The introspective quality is often wanting. The ability to reproduce the original experience is feeble. For this reason Bremond explains that a large proportion of writings dealing with this experience have very little value. Mystics as such, therefore, do not belong *per se* to the teaching Church. The moment they take this function they are no longer mystics but theologians, philosophers and poets as the case may be, sometimes good, sometimes bad; sometimes worthy of admiration; at other times objects of pity and of criticism.

One of the most frequent phrases used in connection with the specific experience of the mystic is the word love. This describes the intimate relation of union between the soul and God. The knowledge of God is put in terms of love and this sentimental side of the mystical union has led to exaggerations and not a few misunderstandings. The mystical knowledge of God is a knowledge which is so intimate that it could only be described in the phrase-

ology of the human emotion. This does not mean that God can only be loved with a disinterested love through the grace bestowed by mystical union; but it does mean that the object of mystical contemplation can best be described in a term which eliminates the schematism of the processes of thought. Here again one has a point of contact with the study of aesthetics already noticed in this article. Bremond quotes with approval a passage written by a French author in the seventeenth century, who was concerned with the debated question of Quietism and its emphasis on the pure love of God. According to Decaussad all love is the same; there are not two kinds. The perfection of love comes through a more continuous, a more habitual, a more dominant exercise of the love common to all. Bossuet says, "Between love and pure love the only distinction that can be made is a distinction of degree." It is all essentially disinterested; as we know from St. Paul love seeks not its own.

Pure love is found in the spiritual life; first of all in the practice of the simple, faithful members of the Church, then in those who have the grace of mystical union. That special training which fits the individual for the attainment of the mystical union with its various tests and questionings is nothing more than the progressive purification of love. One of the difficulties in the phenomenon of ecstasy has always been the emphasis laid upon the passive attitude of man's nature during the process of divine intuition. Some forms of mysticism have advocated the neglect of the ordinary activities of the Christian life, audible prayers, meditation, attendance at the Sacraments, devotions, the practice of positive virtues. The perfect initiate is supposed to reach the happy state in which mystical contemplation goes on almost uninterruptedly. Ecstasy is the normal condition. There is no desire either to do good or to avoid evil; the attainment of the divine vision is sufficient. Wherever the great mystics have seemed to lend their authority to such teach-

ings it is evident that in their own lives they have shown a juster sense of proportion; no man can become a mere system and no mystic is the incarnation of mysticism.

The danger of misinterpretation should act and has really acted as a curb upon the Christian mystics when they became aware of the facility with which their teaching might end in encouraging a kind of religious life altogether inconsistent with the original deposit of the faith. Bremond holds that the entire trouble originated from the popular use of the phrase "passive or passivity," introduced into Christian usage from Neoplatonic writers. Certain mystics think and say that God alone acts in them. This is true, but God's activity stimulates man's activity in a more direct and more efficacious manner than is done in the acts of our common life. The faculties called into action during the experience of ecstasy can in no way be said to be passive, for the repression of the human will is an act of heroic self-sacrifice. It is the self-sacrifice one sees in daily life, only carried to a higher degree. Here there is no question of passivity. Christian mysticism also is in its essence untainted by pantheism, because the Christian mystics realize to the full that they are persons distinct from the universe and from God. With this conviction firmly embedded in their consciousness they can use a phraseology which taken by itself might imply a pantheistic absorption in the one absolute Being.

Devotion is not identical with ecstasy, yet the point of transition between the two is imperceptible. Devotion looks to mysticism as to its normal fruition and the two states of spiritually, elevated devotion and mystical ecstasy are related. St. Theresa is authority for the statement that if a sincerely devout soul failed to obtain this supreme crown it would constitute a derogation of the laws of mysticism. The close association between the two is plain in the case of *The Imitation of Christ*, interpreted by some as being purely devotional while

others regard it as essentially mystical. Devotion is the flower and mystical union is the fruit. Devotion is a continual process; mystical union is an occasional, not a normal type of experience.

From one point of view mystical experience means the abiding union with God; only the special revelation of this union can attain at intervals its constant and familiar form of ecstasy. Even when these experiences are interrupted or suspended the transformation of the personality continues. St. Francis of Sales speaks convincingly of the abiding influence on man's faculties of these spiritual experiences. He did not hesitate to use the word "ecstasy" in regard to action and life. "It is always possible to live a superhuman and spiritual, a devout and ecstatic life,—that is to say a life which in every respect is apart from and above our natural condition."

It must not be imagined that in treating his subject Bremond applies in a forced way the principles worked out by him in his discussion of Mysticism in general. Those who are familiar with Baron von Huegel's *Life of St. Catherine of Genoa* will remember how after a careful documentary investigation of this saint's biography he discusses her religious experiences at length as typical of the best and sanest type of mysticism. Bremond's plan has much less formalism. The method he follows is specifically indicated by the title of his work which is a *Literary History*. "I am not writing a book of speculation. The fine passages I quote and the noble actions I relate definitely formulate—or assume when they are translated in the order of facts—the catholic doctrine of the spiritual life which I accept without hesitation, but which I do not aim to expound dogmatically. What interests us here is not mystical experience itself but the mystic life. It belongs to the theologian, to the psychologist to analyze this experience. It is our task to follow the radiation from it in history and in the writings of the mystics."

With his fine sense of literary values, Bremond is able

to call the reader's attention to the contribution made by the French mystics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the language and literature of their country. The classical period of the French language had not yet opened. French prose was still in a formative shape; experiments were being made; the influence of Latin phraseology and Latin construction was still potent. The quotations embodied in Bremond's text show the vigour and freshness of direct experience. It is not easy for a mystic to be a mere imitator and copier. Nothing would be more incongruous for a mystic than to adopt in questions of style affecting his thought the scheme recommended by Robert Louis Stevenson to literary aspirants.

In the course of Bremond's history nothing is plainer than the dynamic energy in character, feeling and judgment produced by the devotional life of Mysticism. In one place speaking of one of the subordinate leaders in his group of mystics, Bremond says: "The intimate records of Catherine given at length, the narrative and the direct explanations involved in it, are of a heavenly simplicity and sincerity. Not a drop of that oily, insipid unction which too often offends us in works of this kind, not a suspicion of devotional rhetoric." Artificiality in expression or life is antagonistic to mysticism. One especially notes this antagonism in the women mystics. In most cases they were women of very decided character. Their sheer common sense, their gift of intuition in practical matters, their ability to apply striking gifts of judgment to the details of actual life is frequently illustrated. Where one finds many illustrations of this temperamental vigour it would be hard to single out one or two examples as isolated from the rest of the group.

In the first two volumes of Bremond's work no one exemplifies better the combination of the highest gifts of the mystical life and the ability to grapple with the thorny problems of actual existence than Marie de Valence. She was unlike the supposed ideal of the woman mystic,

who is regarded as best fitting her environment when she is a cloistered nun. Marie de Valence had to live with a husband who was a very ordinary individual. He seems in certain respects to have resembled Daudet's famous hero, Tartarin. Marie had the cares of a household and yet in this commonplace and usual environment she passed through the stages of mystical devotion. There was little encouragement from the official clergy in the town in which she lived, but she sturdily kept on in her own path irrespective of criticism at home and abroad. She had always the common sense characteristic of the French woman in every age and never in the midst of her exalted religious experiences when she saw visions and attained the culminating point of mystic adoration did she lose the qualities of her nature in its native power and simplicity. Bremond well says she disliked "playing the saint." She had a shrewd sense of humour and did not hesitate to exercise it.

Belonging to an altogether different level of society Mme. Acarie is herself as typical of the influence of mysticism as Marie de Valence. Mme. Acarie was a member of the great world. She lived in the centre of political and social life. Her own conversion dated from the time when as a young married woman she by accident was led to read a collection of devotional works which her husband left on her table as a substitute for a collection of popular romances of the day. As the head of a large household and with many social obligations Mme. Acarie was able despite these distractions to surrender herself to the call of the mystic devotional life. Many details are given of the phenomena of ecstasy she often experienced. There was no eclipse of practical judgment because of these experiences. She was an admirable mother and a judicious friend. Her biographer relates that she had the gift of the "discerning of spirits"; that is, she intuitionally appreciated the hidden workings of character and disposition among those with whom she came in contact. After the

death of her husband she became the head of a religious community and in this capacity she showed originality and independence.

Mme. Acarie wrote nothing herself and we only catch reflections of her powers and gifts in the accounts written of her by men of very mediocre capacity, yet even in this inadequate medium we have glimpses of a great and inspiring character. One day she was asked, her biographer relates, why she had not undertaken to write of the spiritual life considering the experience which she had had of it. She replied that at the beginning she had written something but that afterwards she burned everything up seeing how mean and small her words were. To speak of God she had to forget herself: "So soon," she said, "as I am aware of myself, seeing manifestly that the things of God are so exalted and that my words come from a source so debased and so poor, all that I say seems to me so inadequate that I have no heart for it."

In speaking of her mystical experiences she also was most reserved, in fact they only became known by being witnessed by others and she discouraged curiosity even in her most intimate friends. When an acquaintance spoke—an ecclesiastic by the way—of the sublimity of her religious experiences, she answered without any hesitation: "I should be satisfied if I could live in the fear of God, in the observance of His commandments, and know how to say my rosary properly. What can a married woman such as I am do with a household on her hands and children to bring up?"

The point of contact between the highest phases of mysticism and the life of the ordinary Christian is expressed in the following passage quoted by Bremond from Leon. "Whatever may be said about it, there is no Christian who by the solemnity of the profession made at the holy font of Baptism is not obliged to undertake the study and practice of mystical theology. All the admirable sentiments applied at the present time almost

entirely to the monastic state originally and literally belonged to all Christians. You are no longer of this world. You are dead and your life is hid in God. For whom, oh my Master, are you announcing all these glorious oracles? For the cloister? Not originally. For the whole Church. To whom and about whom were you intending to speak, oh supreme St. Paul? Of hermits, of nuns, of members of the Benedictine and Dionysian order? Not a bit of it. Whom then do you mean? Of the baptized, of the faithful, of Christians in general?"

This quotation supplies a clue to the trend of mysticism described by Bremond. It explains its origin and in understanding its origin the modern reader can place himself in sympathetic accord with it. Wherever the French mystics of this age are found either in secular pursuits or in ecclesiastical positions the ideals held by them are strictly ideals derived from the history of Christian monasticism. It is natural therefore to expect that the members of the mystical group should find their true satisfaction in the discipline of monastic life. France had gone through a terrible period of religious dissension which had brought the country almost to destruction and which had undermined all the stable factors of social life. The work of restoration meant a return to a stricter type of living and all the mystics in Bremond's pages looked forward to a revival of religion in France specifically along the line of monastic reform.

With the changes in social life, especially those changes due to the rise of the modern state, anything resembling a revival of mediaeval monasticism was out of the question. The monastery in the Middle Ages fulfilled various functions in society that were directly connected with the existence of a form of government whose chief object was military operations. With the loss of its social functions the monastery became to a certain extent an atrophied survival. Monastic life in France after the age of religious revolution was directed by the ideals of mysticism; the

monastery was specifically the place which offered an opportunity for personal devotional life where the devotee could be protected from the distractions of outside influences. One finds in Bremond's pages sources of information of precious value to the student of modern monasticism.

The title selected by Bremond for his first volume is "Devotional Humanism." This might appear at first sight to be misleading, because one could hardly put in the class of humanists any of the men or women who are mentioned. No evidence is presented to show that the study of classical antiquity was a subject of predominating interest. No names can be found in the first volume to be placed alongside the great leaders of humanism such as Isaac Casaubon, J. C. Scaliger, Justus Lipsius or Henry Stephanus. The term "Humanism" is in a general sense appropriate only because the religious sentiments that belong to this initial period of the mystical revival were not expressed in the form of scholastic theology. In this respect one might say that Hooker's work was a representative piece of humanism, although Hooker himself made no contribution of any kind to classical scholarship. Still his habits of thought were not influenced by scholasticism, and the meaning of the term "humanism" in this connection can be established by contrasting Hooker with Thomas Pecock of the preceding century, whose book on the *Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy* might well be placed by the side of Hooker's famous anti-puritanical apologia. All the English writers on church questions in the early Stuart period were humanists in the broader sense. They were the product of a new type of education which had grown up throughout Europe under the influence of Erasmus, Valdes and other humanist leaders.

One of the champions of "devotional humanism" and the one with whom Bremond shows the most sympathy is the forgotten worthy Yves de Paris. This Capuchin monk recalls some of the famous figures of English seven-

teenth century literature. In a French dress he held the religious position that belongs in England to the Cambridge school of Platonists. If Yves had been an Englishman Walton would have been delighted to have incorporated his name in his collection of "Lives." Bremond lovingly restores this once famous leader to an exalted position in the French mystical movement. Yves was a man of sound learning, of indefatigable industry and of profound religious sympathies. He was the author of works on Christian ethics, natural theology and mystical speculation. Like his contemporaries in England, his work is incorporated in many volumes—all of them to-day long since forgotten. Bremond gives many extracts from these writings and they fully bear out his contention that Yves is an author who must be reckoned with both because of his gifts as a writer and also because of the broad sweep of his learning and his sympathies. There are many passages replete with quaint humour and reminding us of Thomas Fuller; others give an insight into his power of analyzing the psychology of the contemplative life.

Yves was aware of the pitfalls that surrounded mystical exaltation and he puts the case with great effect in the following passage: "I am afraid," he said, "that these over-refined devotions which allow only a pure love are vain; they dissipate themselves altogether in words; they take away action from our love by depriving it of any respect for its own interests and they leave no material for grace after destroying nature with such violence." Another passage shows his ability to describe the tests of mystic union. In this situation he says: "Memory is altogether deprived of its essential factors, the judgment abandons the orderly processes of reason, the will alone is allowed to have its entrance into these ineffable glories, into these eternal potencies of vision and while doing this, to possess blessings that cannot be conceived of. Sometimes the will is in a state of solemn festival, in a holy

condition of rest which places it beyond the vicissitudes of the world, which suspends the ordinary exercise of its actions. Again it finds itself carried away by invincible impulse which bids it undertake everything." The following quotation, one of striking beauty and convincing power, is in a work in which Yves studies the first stage of the spiritual life. "If beauty, if virtue, if science are to be conceded this advantage, that is of being loved for themselves, and if those who pursue them for other motives seem to profane their merits, these are only tests which should instruct the heart to give itself with pure and entire impulses to the sovereign good." In his analysis of the work of this writer, Bremond shows how are here combined contemplation and practice. Yves was one of those pure and radiant intelligences who do not appear to have "sinned in Adam"; he was altogether light.

One of the most impressive points in mysticism is its fundamental optimistic outlook on the possibilities of the soul. We can see how from this point of view there is an impassable barrier between the French mysticism of this age and the contemporary movement of Jansenism which so profoundly effected the French Church of the seventeenth century. Bremond realizes how much he is handicapped in presenting the details of a movement which has no such popular champion as Pascal and which possesses no such interpreter as Saint Beuve. It is not possible nor would it be desirable to conceal the achievements of Port Royal. Some of the most attractive and forceful characters in religious history are connected with French Jansenism. Human nature in its excellencies can overcome the defects of a narrow and one-sided religious system. Bremond himself is aware that the Christian life as a whole cannot be forced into the mould of monasticism even when this monasticism is exquisitely refined and visibly embodied in the devotional practices of the characters he so successfully brings back to life in the initial volumes of his great work.

The Permanent Meaning of Propitiation

By C. C. J. Webb, M.A.,
Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford.

I shall not here attempt to discuss the history of the notion of Propitiation, which has played so important a part in the theology of Christendom. I shall not ask what light is thrown upon it by the researches of anthropologists, the comparative study of religions, the examination of the teaching of the Old or New Testament, or of that of the Fathers of the Christian Church. I shall take the notion that the word "Propitiation" suggests to the minds of most of us when we hear it used: the notion of a God who is displeased with us because we have transgressed his law and who will not put away his displeasure until the transgressor or someone in his stead has undergone some loss or suffering which can be somehow set against the transgression so as to cancel it in the eyes of the person offended thereby. I have stated it in this unattractive form because I want to emphasize at the outset those features in the conception which render it, with the whole system of theological doctrines connected with it, so generally uncongenial and unacceptable to the mood and temper of our generation as it must, I think, be in fairness admitted that it is. It will be my task to attempt to show that there are wrapped up in the conception certain truths of permanent importance to religion, and to disentangle these from what I regard as mistakes which have often been, and in some cases still are, asso-

ciated with them in the minds of those who have been most impressed with their importance.

I will then in the first place ask: What in particular are those points in the doctrine of the necessity of a propitiation for sin, taken somewhat as I have above described it, which are uncongenial and unacceptable to the mood and temper of our generation? I think I may state them as three.

(1). There is the view of punishment as due to sin. We are apt to think of sin rather as a disease to be cured than as a fault to be punished. What passes under the name of punishment we tend to justify, if we justify it at all, as—like the surgeon's knife (which if an anaesthetic can save us from feeling, so much the better)—merely instrumental to a curative process and possessing no intrinsic value of its own.

(2). We distrust what in a courageously candid essay by Mr. Harold Anson, *Prayer as Understanding*, in a recent book entitled *Concerning Prayer*, is called "the sultanic view of God." We suspect that our traditional formularies bear all too obviously the brand of their origin among men who were accustomed to picture the supreme authority in the community as a capricious and self-indulgent individual, vain of his power over his fellow men and proud of displaying it, greedy of adulation and impatient of opposition. We wonder whether our thought of God ought not to be somehow refashioned on a more modern and democratic pattern.

(3). Lastly, we are inclined to think that the whole theology of propitiation embarrasses our faith in God's goodness and justice by the suggestion that he is not content with the sinner's repentance and amendment—that something else is required of which we could have known nothing but for a positive "revelation," vouchsafed as it seems by a series of historical accidents to some and not to others, the credentials of which, moreover, are admittedly much in question, and, however strong they may

be, can only be appreciated with the help of a special training such as the greater part of mankind has neither the opportunity nor the aptitude for acquiring.

I propose to deal with these three misgivings, as I call them, in turn. (1). In the limited space at my disposal it will be necessary to express myself as it were dogmatically and to state what seems to me to be true about these important subjects with less argumentative defence of my views than they may appear to some to need. Thus I may state quite briefly that, so far as I can see, the only intelligible theory of punishment is that which is commonly called the *retributive* theory. On the theory that punishment is to be justified by its deterrent effect I need not dwell. I think no one is likely to find it satisfactory. When we beat an animal to prevent it from doing again something which we wish it never to do, without believing that there is in the whole business anything but the establishment of an association in its memory between the forbidden act and the consequent pain, one feels that, if we call this punishment at all, we are using the word merely as it were by courtesy. To suppose that in punishing our fellow-men we are dealing with them only in this way, and with an eye to others who may take warning by their fate, is surely incompatible with that respect for them which is due to them as persons. Those who know Carlyle's *Latter-Day Pamphlet* on *Modern Prisons* will remember the fine scorn which he there pours upon this theory of punishment. It is indeed one which coheres only with a philosophy that can give no real significance to such words as "desert," "duty" and "punishment." Far more plausible is the so-called *reformatory* theory of punishment. This acknowledges in the wrong-doer a consciousness of an obligation under which he stands and of his own failure to fulfil it; and this consciousness it treats as no mere illusion, but as the apprehension of something real in his conduct. He is *really* in a state in which he ought not to be, and we want to make him better. The

infliction of pain may be a necessary or at least an efficacious means toward this end. Pain inflicted with this purpose in view is what we call punishment. But it has no virtue in itself. The whole value of it lies in the result which it is designed to bring about—the reformation of the wrong-doer. The popularity of this theory is largely due to the fact that it is in practice no bad guide for legislators and administrators in the devising and carrying out of penal regulations. It is common ground among those who seriously consider this matter that the estimate which a human judge can form of the culpability of the individual who breaks a law is very liable to error. Only he who "knoweth whereof we are made" can judge infallibly how far each of us is to blame in a particular case. Nor, though a civilized code will endeavour by rules of equity, by judicial discretion, by consideration of extenuating circumstances, by a prerogative of pardon, and so forth, to prevent the unjust application to an individual offender of a law which is necessarily general in its terms, and framed in view of the average citizen, can any such device prevent altogether the possibility of a failure of justice here and there. It even seems to the interest of every man that the rule of law should be known of all men; and this could scarcely be were it indefinitely elastic and not rather up to a certain point rigid. All these things considered, it is easy to see that a penal code, which must inevitably bring within its scope men the real degree of whose guilt is doubtful, is best so devised that where it cannot fulfil the proper function of punishment it may at least advantage the culprit in some other way.

But it should be no less easy to see that no one would call making a person better even by painful means "punishment" (any more than one would give that name to the cure of a sick person by a painful process), unless they had in their minds all the time a quite different conception of punishment as something which they were aiming at on its own account, but think they can best

secure by this particular method. The reformatory theory of punishment, if by that be understood the doctrine that there is nothing sought in punishment except a general improvement of the person punished, is really not an explanation of punishment at all, but an assertion that only one thing, viz., improvement, has been in question where we had thought there were two.

This explanation of punishment has sometimes claimed in its support the great authority of Plato. But Plato's view was on the whole, as I understand it, this: that punishment, *because it is punishment*, is the natural way in which the evil of sin is taken away, as that of disease is taken away by the practice of the medical art. Punishment was indeed, he taught, not to be regarded as something merely external, to be inflicted without any consideration of the soul of the person punished. The end is the good of that person's soul; but it is to Plato's mind a truth of the highest importance that the man who does wrong and is punished for it is better off than the man who does wrong and goes unpunished. For punishment is sin's desert; and the sinner who escapes it is in a worse state than he who undergoes it, because he remains with his sin still upon him. This is a doctrine which does not make of punishment a mere means to improvement, but recognizes the essential nature of punishment as that which the sinner's own conscience demands and to which he may without absurdity be said to have a right.

Hence it is that a man who has a deep sense of his own wrong-doing will not be content with a mere good-natured dismissal even by the person offended. He can only accept whole-heartedly a forgiveness which does not ignore the heinousness of what is forgiven. Such forgiveness may play the part of "the coals of fire" assigned by the old Jewish sage to the ministrations of a compassionate enemy, and so may be itself a severe punishment; but in any case it takes up punishment into itself by recognizing the true nature of the sin as *deserving* it. At the same time

it is to be noted as a corollary of the view of punishment which I am defending that except so far as the criminal himself recognizes his punishment as deserved it misses its aim, and hence regard should be paid in the distribution of punishments to the habits of mind—even to the prejudices—of those upon whom they are likely to fall. That a punishment should be disliked is to be expected: that it should be resented as unjust is to be avoided as a serious failure in the administration of justice. I am aware that I have only touched upon this subject very lightly and inadequately. But I hope that my suggestion is clear that the notion of propitiation is not to be discarded because it treats sin as deserving of punishment, since no other view of their relation than this is really satisfactory to our moral consciousness. So much for the first of the three misgivings we are to examine.

(2) Mr. Harold Anson, in the essay which I have already mentioned as contributed to the volume called *Concerning Prayer* with the title *Prayer as Understanding*, expends some severe criticism on what he describes as "the sultanic view of God." He finds in much of the traditional language of piety and worship something only appropriate to a representation of God which made of him a glorified "sultan" or despot, capriciously wielding a power over the lives of his subjects, against the use of which to their detriment it was only prudent to provide by timely adulation. Mr. Anson would lead us to substitute for this spirit another which seems to him more congenial to the temper of self-governing citizens. Not homage such as is paid to a king, but the effort to understand, which is the scientific man's tribute to Nature, is to be the pattern on which our Godward attitude is henceforth to model itself. Now I do not wish to deny that there is much of value in this suggestion. Christian theology follows Plato in representing God as an unenvious, an ungrudging God. Our Lord sets before us his Father as not holding back from his children any good thing that we

ask. So too in the Fourth Gospel God's Word made flesh is described as saying to his disciples, "Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth; but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." It is well to ask ourselves whether we do not respect the wisdom of the man of science, the scholar or philosopher, which asks nothing of us but that we should share its gains, more than we do the dignity of the ruler, whose anxiety for his prerogative leads him to find enjoyment in his subjects' recognition of his superiority and to take pains to put them and keep them in their own subordinate place; and whether we must not acknowledge a divine attribute in what we feel to be a nobler frame of mind rather than in what we feel to be a less noble. Such considerations tend to refine and to enrich our thoughts of God and prevent them from being confined by tradition and convention within certain familiar limits.

But when all is said, I think that our instinct of worship will not be satisfied if we eliminate altogether that attitude of joy in prostration before a transcendent majesty, if I may so call it, which the writer of the Apocalypse symbolizes in the falling down of the four and twenty elders before him that sat on the throne, and which has so often found expression in glorious works of Christian art. Loyal homage may often have been paid to those very unworthy of it; as for that matter charlatans have often, no less than genuine philosophers, attracted troops of enthusiastic disciples. But, just as to give any meaning to the recommendations of Mr. Anson's essay on *Prayer as Understanding* one must have felt the desire to understand the world about us and known it to be a worthy sentiment: so, there must be some comprehension of what loyalty to a prince or chief is, some hierarchical sympathies, if I may use the expression, before we can enter into the full appreciation of what divine worship has meant and can mean to the human soul.

But the question is often asked now—and it is implied in Mr. Anson's essay—is there not a necessarily ever-widening gap between the old monarchical imaginations which have entered so deeply into religious art and literature, and the modern democratic convictions of so many among us? Must not we refashion our thoughts of God so that they shall not be continually jarring with the sentiments which dominate our social and political life? This opens up a wide and extremely interesting question, upon which I can only throw out a few observations for consideration, which, if they seem to anyone paradoxical, may for that very reason prove provocative of further thought.

In speaking of punishment I maintained that, while it was impossible to see in it no more than an instrument for reforming the criminal in the same sense as that in which the teaching of a trade or the provision of interesting books may be so regarded, yet there were good reasons for so devising a penal code as to include such measures as these, and others intended to enable those whose offences may bring them within its scope to leave prison better equipped for life and citizenship than they entered it. For in this way two birds, as the proverb says, are killed with one stone in the case of those who really deserve punishment; and, where, owing to the necessary imperfection of human justice, a man is subjected to punishment who is not really responsible for what he did amiss, or who is through mental incapacity disqualified for receiving the proper benefit of punishment, he may notwithstanding receive some genuine advantage from the process intended as punishment.

We may, I think, find an analogy from this state of things useful to us in thinking about such subjects as sovereignty, loyalty, political obligation. For one may here quite well admit or even insist that only where the members of the community freely choose or accept for themselves the person or persons in whom the sovereign

authority is reposed, is there an adequate security that this person or these persons, since they are not of different clay from those that are to be in subjection to them, will be able to appeal to a sense that the government *has* authority and can claim loyalty and obedience from its subjects. In other words the true ground of preference of free or popular institutions over despotic lies not in this: that no one is really under *obligation* to obey any authority but one which is ultimately *his own;* but in this: that only where he has himself a say in appointing or accepting the vehicles of that authority can he be counted upon to acquiesce in their authority as—not his own—but the best representative he can find of God's. The onesided doctrine of the divine right of kings, that is to say, embodied one half of the true doctrine of political obligation, while the onesided doctrine of the rights of man embodied the other. In the process of reaction from the error which invested certain particular modes of selecting the supreme authorities in the community with a religious sanctity, it is apt to be forgotten that there is a sense in which authority is not really authoritative at all unless it be essentially God's and not our *own* in any sense in which we can at all contrast our own with God's.

No one in the modern world has taught with a more uncompromising and impressive insistence the unconditional and indefectible claim on every man's allegiance of the moral law than has Kant. He gave to it, as is well known, the title of *Categorical Imperative*, meaning thereby that it belonged to the very essence of morality that in the last resort no further reason can be given for the claim of what is *right* upon us than that it is *right.* But he was, as I venture to think, less happy in another phrase which he used and made current—that of *autonomy*, as characteristic of the morally good will. By this phrase he intended to call attention to a fact of very high importance. When I only will some course of action because someone else tells me it is right, or because I see that it

conduces to something else which I desire, I do not in the strictest sense will that course of action as just the one thing to be willed, as the unconditionally right and good thing. Just in the same way when I make a mathematical statement on the authority of a text book or of a professor of the science, or because I see that it will bring out the result hoped for, that is not really seeing the necessity of the statement. That I must do for myself immediately if I am to do it at all; I must see that this is the only thing that could be said in the case. Now I may quite intelligibly say that I only *will* for myself in the fullest sense what I will as the only thing to be willed, the one right thing, just as I may intelligibly say that I only just *think* in the fullest sense what I see to be the one thing thinkable. And it was with this meaning that Kant spoke of the good will as *autonomous*.

But the language may be misleading, if it be allowed to suggest that it is from my willing what is right that the obligation to do it comes. I cannot, however, really think that my willing it is the source of my obligation to do it; although except by willing it I cannot realize the obligation, and in realizing the obligation I must so far in a sense will it, even if I do not actually will to do it, but take another and therefore wrong course. Just so I can only really think mathematically so far as I see for myself the mathematical necessity of what I think, and in so seeing the necessity of something, I must certainly think it so to be; although I may break off thinking of it at all rather than pursue the subject further, yet I do not and cannot regard the necessity of what I thus think as due to my thinking it. I consider therefore that the view of God which expresses itself in calling him King and Lord—a view which is sometimes nowadays described as the acknowledgment of his transcendence—is an integral part of a tenable theology and cannot be safely omitted in order to give a more democratic colour to our religion. Rather it is important to recognize in ethics and

even in politics that the conception of authority implies something in this sense "transcendent" and not explicable on merely "democratic" principles.

(3) The last misgiving about the theological doctrine of propitiation which I proposed to consider is that which seems to myself by far the most serious. It is the misgiving which arises when we ask ourselves whether we are not embarrassing our religion by something which, just where religious experience is deepest and purest, appears superfluous and superstitious. When the prophet Micah says (6:6 sq.): "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"; and when the Psalmist of the Miserere says: "Thou delightest not in sacrifice, else would I give it. Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise"; above all, when our Lord tells us of the prodigal son's return to his father and the welcome which he found; do we not seem to be in a region where it would be an impertinence to insist that God requires, beside justice and mercy, beside the contrite and humble heart, a sacramental washing or participation in a sacramental meal? or that, though nothing is said of it in the parable, apart from a mysterious transaction, whereby the incarnate Son of God offered himself up in sacrifice for men, the returning prodigal could have found no welcome? Does not the emphasis laid by orthodox theologies on the need of pleading the Redeemer's sacrifice, or on the use of the means of grace, come perilously near to making the word of God—such words of God as I have quoted

—of none effect by our traditions? We may in passing notice that, if it be so, it is not only one school of piety in the Church that is in this danger. Many who would most earnestly repudiate the necessity of external ordinances for salvation and would dwell most strongly on the sufficiency of a conversion of the heart are among those who lay most stress upon the indispensableness to salvation of the work of Christ and of the appropriation of it by faith. And yet the prophet and the psalmist and our Saviour himself in his parable say as little of the sacrifice of the Cross as they do of Baptism or the Eucharist.

We are here in the presence of a problem which it might seem easy to solve by the simple method of saying that the sacraments have a value merely as venerable and impressive symbols of certain inward experiences but are in no way an integral part of the process of the reconciliation of man with God nor to be required of anyone who feels no wish to express his feelings in this way: or again that, however precious may be the record of the holy life and death of the Founder of our religion as (in the words of the collect) a pattern of godly life, yet according to his own teaching, the Father is ever ready to give good gifts to those that ask him without reference to an event which, after all, had not occurred when Jesus himself came calling upon his hearers to repent and believe the good news of the coming kingdom and saying nothing of a future oblation of himself, apart from which the Father's favour was unattainable.

But simple as would be this way of solving our problem, we must not overlook the fact that in so doing we should be cutting ourselves loose from historical Christianity, which has indubitably been characterized throughout the ages by the worship of the sacrificed Lamb of God and by the mystical feeding upon his flesh and blood in the Eucharist; so that a religion which dispensed with this whole range of ideas could hardly claim to be Christianity even though it might plausibly be argued that it was nearer to

the religion taught by Jesus himself in the days of his flesh than historical Christianity has usually been. Now it is worth observing that we should be on our guard here against an illusion of historical perspective. When Christianity first appeared in the world it was in a world familiar with sacrificial ritual that it appeared. What was new in Christianity was not that it had a doctrine of propitiation. Its distinctive characteristics were rather its pure morality, its enthusiasm of brotherhood, its indifference to worldly considerations, its assurance of a communion with God and one another which death could not interrupt. The simplicity of its worship, the absence of much that was associated with religious ceremonies led even to the charge of atheism. But naturally enough from New Testament times onward the Church claimed that she also had an altar. What slaughter of an unwilling animal, not knowing what was done to it, could equal in value the voluntary self-surrender of Christ? The physical perfection demanded of the victim under the law was but a type and figure of his moral stainlessness. And the *reasonable* service of praise and thanksgiving which Christians offered up when they met for the solemn meal of bread and wine wherein was commemorated the last supper and death of the Lord,—was not that more worthy than were the blood-stained rites of the heathen or even of the ancient Israelites, of the old language of devotion, even (eventually) of the old splendour and ceremony?

But when the Christian doctrines of the spirituality of God and the brotherhood of all men had become the common faith of civilized men and the Christian morality their accepted rule of conduct, then the sacrificial phraseology in which it was formerly natural for Christians as for others to clothe their religious emotions, lacking its old root in familiarity with actual sacrifices, came to be taken as though it were a kind of special Christian addition to natural or rational religion, which concerned itself wholly with what was speculatively demonstrable or

morally obligatory. The grand achievement of Christianity in Europe, as of the Jewish religion in a narrower sphere, had been this, that it had, like Greek philosophy (with which Christianity early allied itself) purified the conception of God, without, like Greek philosophy, falling out of touch with the actual religious sentiment and practice of mankind in general. But in a later age, the result of this very achievement in the Christianization of the religious instincts and traditions of the multitude led to an insidious contrast between the Christianity which had taken them up into an intimate association with its spiritual teaching, and the free thought which, like that of the ancient Greeks, could rise above those encumbering superstitions in doctrine and practice, though at the risk of starving the instinctive cravings of many a devoutly religious soul.

Christianity is after all a religion: it is the religion of the Spirit: but there are times when there is a danger not only of a materialistic religion but of a spirituality which has lost the religious temper. At such times Christianity may have to insist upon the need of the religious temper, and the sacrificial language which embalms an immemorial religious tradition may be then something not to be lightly laid aside.

Yet assuredly no view can be made consistent with the teaching of such a passage as the parable of the prodigal son which insists that genuine penitence is not *enough* without something else over and above this—whether belief in a past event, or use of a present ordinance—to win the divine forgiveness. What is there then for the sacrificial language to express? The direction in which we are to look for an answer to this question may best be learned from a survey of Christian religious experience. Who does not know the power that the story of the Cross has to awaken that spirit at once of humblest penitence and of firmest confidence in the fatherly love of God which it is the very purpose of the parable of the prodigal

son to arouse in the sinner? "So God loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish." Wherein lies the extraordinary strength of that appeal? In the ritual of sacrifice men who knew themselves alienated from their God had sought to bring themselves again into fellowship with him, recognizing that this is not to be done without some surrender of what is most precious, without some pain and loss, which yet was all worth while if thereby could be effected a real union with the powers that control the issues of life. That such means of reconciliation were to be had, that God himself had provided such, thereby showing himself placable and ready to welcome his people who had been separated from him back into fellowship with him, was the teaching of many religions older than Christianity. That God was a gracious and loving Father, who would readily welcome even the most far-wandered prodigal who would return and come to him with a frank acknowledgment of his fault was the teaching of our Lord. That in the life and death of him who thus taught there was given a pledge of the truth of what he taught in that here was seen what true sonship to God was, and that this most loyal sonship did not shrink from the extreme of self-surrender, of suffering, and of loss, when once he had joined himself with the fate of those who knew themselves in contrast with him for prodigal sons, and recognized in the evils which befell him the due reward not of his sinlessness but of their own sin: this was the discovery of the Christian Church. It illuminated for its members the lesson of the parable by giving it a theological background: showing them God as one who is eternally a Father because he has an eternal Son: and his free forgiveness as no indifference to the gravity of the sin which severs the sinner from him, but as the outflow of a love which has itself borne in the passion and death of his only-begotten Son whatever of tragic consequences the gravity of sin could have entailed.

The distinction between a religious and a non-religious morality lies just in this, that for the latter man struggles with no assurance of victory in obedience to a voice which cries as it were in the wilderness of an alien world: for the former, man struggles with the knowledge that he has with him in the struggle the fellowship of the supreme and ultimate power, and that it is from this power that the voice proceeds which calls on him for complete and unconditional surrender. The parable of the prodigal son is one which assures him of this divine sympathy, and of this divine origin of that voice of the moral law whose authority, so Butler says, is "manifest," whencesoever it may come. Nothing is added to the requirement of a genuine repentance as the sole condition of forgiveness when it is recognized that in the life and death of Jesus is manifested the Fatherhood of God and the nature of that divine mercy which is ready to welcome every sinner that, like the prodigal son, throws himself in penitence upon it. Again, nothing is added when the Church sets forth in the sacramental symbols of Baptism and the Eucharist the divine forgiveness and the divine fellowship which are thus awaiting every sinner who will claim them as the prodigal son did in the parable.

But the use of the sacrificial language in which the Church has ever spoken of the Lord's death and of its commemoration seems to indicate that there is set forth, historically in the one, ritually in the other, that reconciliation and consequent communion with God, the sense of which was the heart of the old sacrificial worship.

I am very far from wishing to search in the parable of the prodigal son, as commentators have sometimes searched, for details that might be interpreted as figurative of doctrines whereon the tradition of the Church has laid a stress which is absent from the teaching of the Lord in the synoptic Gospels. Such treatment of it is rightly felt to do violence to its divine simplicity and straight-

forwardness. But it is legitimate to point out that the prodigal son knew himself to have a father, that he had, like all men, in the language of his people a way of expressing his desire of forgiveness, and that the father's welcome took the form of a feast, with its accessories of festal attire, of music and of dancing. Nothing is added to the terms of forgiveness implied in the parable when it is acknowledged that it is through the story of the Cross that men may be best brought to the consciousness that they have a loving Father; or when the Church provides in the sacraments a means of approach to God and a vehicle of fellowship with him, such as his native language and the feast of welcome were in the case of the prodigal son. Because it would be grotesque to imagine the father in the parable refusing to take back his son because he had not used a special form of words in confessing his fault, or meeting his son with the declaration that he would forgive him on condition of is wearing a certain robe or eating of a certain dish, it is not therefore absurd to note that it would be no less grotesque to imagine the son as insisting on addressing his father not in his own tongue but in that of the far country in which he had been an exile; or as raising difficulties about taking part in the banquet and merrymaking which his father had provided. The parable as little sanctions a pedantic scrupulosity in objecting to the use of customary means of grace as it does the attachment of arbitrary or conventional conditions to the grant of free forgiveness to the penitent sinner. The rejection of sacraments from pride or from unwillingness to commit oneself by the use of them may quite possibly show the imperfection of a man's repentance and self-surrender; just as in the Gospel story did the rich young man's refusal to sell all that he had. But he is then not found wanting because he has not added the use of sacraments to his repentance and self-surrender, but just because his repentance and self-surrender are imperfect.

Something much like what has been here said of the sacraments may be said also of the propitiation which the Christian Church has generally believed to have been accomplished in the past by the death of Jesus on the Cross. It is not to be denied that much of what we regard as characteristic of Christian piety is an inheritance from that religion of the synagogue in which our Lord and his disciples were bred, and that, as it existed there, it was of course unconnected with the doctrine of the Atonement by the death of Christ. We are putting the same point from another side if we remind ourselves that Christian piety has ever found its chief expression in the Psalter. The older Christian tradition reconciled this latter fact with its dogmatic system by seeing everywhere in the Psalms a typical language which had found its fulfilment in Christ. This process was often carried out with much fanciful extravagance and has sometimes tended to obscure the extent to which the language of the Psalms apart from any such interpretation was able to meet the needs of Christian devotion. But there is a sense in which, without committing ourselves to the search for anticipations of the Gospel history in the words of the Psalmists, we may accept the view that these writers speak as "types of Christ." There is a filial temper which finds its best expression in their words and which was manifested in the flesh in Jesus Christ; to the Psalmists themselves it was possible because they stood forth as spokesmen of the people of Israel, the son of God whom by the ministry of Moses he had called forth out of Egypt; to Christians because they are members of the mystical body of Christ, the only begotten Son of God. Where the Psalmists confess their sins and offences, it is again as spokesmen of the people of Israel which has fallen short of what it would have been had it hearkened unto Jahveh. When Christians use their language, they speak as those who have fallen short of the standard of filial obedience and love set them by the example and precept of our Lord.

God is our Father, ready at all times to welcome us as his penitent children, when we unreservedly surrender ourselves to him. But this means that it belongs to the nature of things that there is a sonship of God involving real surrender and self-sacrifice, which may be ours if we will. This is what is set forth to us as an actual fact in the life and death of Christ, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The fact of this relation to God in the nature of things—this relation *in* the nature of God, as the doctrine of the Trinity expresses it—is a fact apart from our knowledge of it, and hence an assent to it as a dogma; a reasoned conviction of the truth of the Gospel story as an historical fact, even a knowledge of the story, are not necessary in addition to the filial surrender in which this sonship becomes our own. Yet normally the Gospel of the Sonship and Atonement of our Lord will continue to be, as it has been in the past, the most powerful means that exists of exciting men to claim for themselves the privilege of divine sonship; and thoughtful men who make the claim will desire to set forth to themselves in some coherent form a view of the world which will place their experience of reconciliation in an intelligible connexion with the other facts of which they are conscious. In other words we need not regard the Gospel history and the Christian dogma as superfluities in religion because acceptance of them is no formal condition annexed by God to his fatherly reception of his prodigal children. An Englishman may willingly die for England with little or no knowledge of England's history, or of her place in the world's civilization —very many have doubtless done so and are doing so in this war. Who will dare to say that they have the less truly died for England on that account? Yet that England wins the loyal affection of her sons just in the way in which she does win it, is not something which would be quite the same if her history had not been what it has. Nor is there anything to be more surely recommended as

a means for kindling the patriotic passion for her than a knowledge of her history—

> "Here and here did England help me;
> How can I help England, say?"

Nor, lastly, will a thoughtful Englishman, in proportion as he is thoughtful, be content not to frame for himself some background for his patriotism in a theory of England's vocation for humanity. And the nearer this theory is to the truth, the more satisfactory will it be as such a background.

Our conclusion then as to the questions which we set out to discuss, questions, it will be remembered, started by certain misgivings which we are inclined to feel about the doctrine of Propitiatory Sacrifice as it has entered into Christian theology and devotion, will be this:

That this doctrine gives expression to the *true* notion of punishment as *due* to sin; to the *true* notion of divine *transcendence*, in contrast with a view of obligation which, after the fashion of modern democratic theory, conceives no source of authority but the general will; and lastly, to the *true* notion of divine *immanence* in contrast with one which lets fall outside of the life of God himself that self-surrender of sonship which can nevertheless certainly count upon God's fatherly acceptance without any arbitrary conditions over and above the reality of the self-surrender itself.

Something About the Study of the Bible

By H. Th. Obbink,
Professor at the University of Utrecht.

The study of non-Christian religions is solely an historical science, but since the historiographer can never confine himself exclusively to the enumeration of bare facts, and his religious attitude appears beneath the lines he writes, this science has aroused the interested attention of the Church, and the interest has in some respects had a stunting effect. Some scholars have indeed in their aversion to the Christian Church and its teachings tried to use the study of religions against the Christian Church, and the Church in its turn has distrusted that science because of its tendency to reduce all religions to the same level.

The Christian Church has, however, no need to resort to this unkind attitude to remove ecclesiastical fear. Many scholars who were not hostile to the Church have been wanting in that religious delicacy that is required for cautious dealing with such nice points. Even before the very foundations were laid and the elements of the problem had been sufficiently controlled, popularizing was undertaken with less sense than arrogance. It has come to pass that Christian preachers, instead of preaching the Gospel truth, have treated their hearers to "the wisdom of past centuries" taken from the sacred books of the Chinese, Egyptians, Indians, and so forth. Anthologies have been collected, in good or bad translations, from sentences of Buddha, Confucius, Mohammed and other "great masters" and these have been put on one level with "aphor-

isms of Jesus Christ." A minister of the Gospel in Holland even expressed a wish that Buddhistic teachings might penetrate the Christian dogmas and practice, and that Christian pulpits should proclaim the names of the great heroes of mankind, Buddha, Confucius, Christ. Babylonian penitential psalms are said to breathe the same spirit as the Biblical Psalms, and many events in the life of Christ are said to be recastings of incidents in the life of Buddha. No wonder that many have distrusted that new science by which the absolute character of Christianity seemed put in question. What place remained, in such a case, for the inspiration of the Bible, apart from all other "sacred writings"? Where was the distinction between the so-called special revelation and universal revelation, a distinction asserted by the confessions, and confessed by the assembly of the faithful in all ages? So it came about, under these influences, that there arose in the bosom of the Christian Church a state of mind that clung more tenaciously than before to the old formulas of faith and was thoroughly hostile to the pernicious influences of the comparative study of religions.

It may indeed seem at first sight that the consequences of this science will be fatal to old cherished religious thought. Some time ago I gave a lecture on the Egyptian pyramids. On that occasion an opponent took exception to my assertion about the oldest remains, saying that according to the Bible the world was created about 4,000 years before Christ, and that a science in disaccord with the Scripture must be on a wrong path. Even more encroaching upon harboured religious thoughts than these chronological questions are the moral and religious ones. Excavations in Egypt, Babylonia, Crete, Asia Minor, and so forth, have brought to light great and mighty cults, with an astonishing religious literature, resembling in many respects that of the Bible. Hitherto one could think of the Bible as an absolutely unique book, with a thoroughly distinctive spirit; now it seemed that there

was very little peculiar to it, since correspondencies to a very great number of Biblical words, terms, sounds, colours, had been found in the ruins of long-forgotten cities. What had been thought the special property of Israel and Christendom proved to be a common possession of the whole ancient world. The forms of law-giving in which the deity acts as legislator, and the whole law gets a divine sanction, the piety of the Psalms with the lamentations for sin, the priesthood, the ark, the prophets, the religious ceremonies,—Babel proved to have possessed them all. The Christian dogmatic terms borrowed from the Bible: sin, remission of sins, faith, atonement, justification, chosen people, saviour, mediator, new birth, eternal life, resurrection, and so forth,—these were known in pre-Christian heathendom, and a disturbing question arose about what was the characteristic feature of Christianity and the Bible. The mischievous joy of some fervent adherents of the all-levelling method was a provocation. "Don't you see yet," they seemed to say, "that the opinion that Christendom alone has the truth, cannot be maintained?"

It seems to me that the levelling method is unjustified, as well as the stubborn resistance to the comparative study of religions, and that it has resulted from a misunderstanding of what the facts in question imply. It seems profitable, therefore, to consider the matter here, in the hope that the view presented will do away with a mistake and bring clearness.

When the terms mentioned above, known to us as Christian dogmatic expressions, and conceived as purely Biblical, are found also in use in the pre-Christian and pre-Israelitic heathen world, one might be inclined to think that if the *words* are present, the *essence* is involved. Such an impression would be very erroneous. An old maxim says: *Duo si dicunt idem non est idem.* When two say the same thing it is not (necessarily) the same thing. Whether a word used in different places and times means

the same thing must be proved by other considerations and is not a matter of course. When the Old Testament uses the same words as Babylon and the New Testament the same as Mithraism, it is for the environment to make clear whether the same things are meant. For instance, the Bablyonian word *chittu* and the Hebrew word *chatta'a* are from the same root, they are the same words and mean: sin. It is the same with the Babylonian *kapparu* and the Biblical *kipper*. They mean: atonement. Does that justify the conclusion that these words cover the same idea? Not at all. It is the *milieu* that gives the elucidation. The Biblical term *chatta'a* has a purely ethical sense, the Babylonian *chittu* has commonly a physical meaning.

Another example may be drawn from the New Testament. The term "new birth" is used in the Gospels as well as in the mystery religions (Mithraism, etc.). Does that imply that this word is used in both religions in the same sense? By no means. In the New Testament "new birth" means the whole renovation of the inner spiritual man and implies a radical change in inner mood, an ethical-religious renewal. In the mystery religions it is a ritual noun: the undergoing of certain ritual ceremonies, in order to become initiate, whereby the inner feeling is not necessarily concerned.

Dozens of instances could be similarly adduced, but those above prepare the way sufficiently for the explanation that follows, and aim to show why the use of ancient terms from the heathen *milieu* does not disturb the peculiar religious atmosphere of the Bible, and why there is no stumbling-block in the Bible's use of the ancient heathen locutions.

Generally speaking, language influences greatly the formation and development of religious ideas. Language is a social phenomenon; that is, language is formed in and by the community, and the individual is bound to that common language in formulating his own thoughts. He

cannot express his ideas in other than common words because he has no other, and if he formed new ones he would not be understood unless he explained his new words by common terms. In western lands with their effectual promoting of the individual, there is always a strong aptitude for individualizing, and originality in seeing and in reproducing the seen thing. The so-called "own vision" and the individualized manner of expressing it in word or picture is highly prized. There is a striving after the creation of new words and uncommon metaphors to express new thoughts or new combinations in a single term. This phenomenon is wholly lacking in the ancient world. There the individual never sees nor says the things otherwise than the community to which he belongs. The whole ancient literature of Egyptians, Babylonians, Israelites, and so forth, exhibits the immutable traditional forms of speech. A poem, a legend, a psalm, a piece of history might be written by A as well as by B, might be written in the fifteenth as well as in the fourth century. All modifications are social and common, and limited to the kind of literature to which they belong; no individuality or "own vision" gleams through the lines. Hence the monstrous and tedious repetitions of the same expressions. Read Psalm 119. Judged by our aesthetic sense the effect is unappeasing and unsatisfactory. But the ancient Oriental was quite satisfied by it, for the individual occupied such an unassuming place. *Milieu* is everything, the individual exists only in connection with the community. The individual who aims at self-reliance becomes an outlaw, socially he no longer exists. Ancient custom rules in every field, in habit, speech, thought. The more ancient the more honourable. What is new is resented.

The impediment against the spread of new thought that arises from this disposition of mind is striking. Only very powerful ideas can push themselves through this barricade, the others are broken against this wall of common

feeling and monotony. Yet, for all that, two spiritual powers did break a way through, Israelitic ethical monotheism and the Gospel. They had their own spiritual sphere and their appearance exercised an irresistible pressure on the old common feeling. These two religions, however, had to pay their debt to the oriental spirit. They could maintain themselves only by clinging close to the common forms of speech, which they did by no afterthought but as matter of course. Hence the terms, expressions, colours, sounds of the Old Testament and the New have the oriental aspect, and the reader who is not on the alert may think he finds in the heathen terms the heathen ideas. We recall, therefore, here the principle already noted: In the ancient Orient the old word is always the doorway for new thought. Thus it is explicable that Israel and Christendom could borrow such terms as sin, atonement, new birth, justification, mediator, saviour, from their heathen *milieu* without taking over the heathen ideas. Thus, using the same words does not imply having the same thoughts. The case is the same with religious acts, offerings, and so forth.

But, since neither words nor acts of themselves justify assumption of the same ideas, how can one tell whether the ancient words are used in a new sense? Surely a conclusion can be drawn only from the atmosphere as a whole. The single phenomenon must be elucidated by the surrounding spirit. For instance, the Egyptian religion has the well-known judgment seat of Osiris in the "Hall of Righteousness." St. Paul speaks of the judgment seat of Christ (II Cor. 5:10). No one can doubt for a moment that the noun "judgment" has in either case quite a different sense. The atmosphere turns the scale. Or take this, an instance of the greatest verbal harmony: The Egyptian as well as the Biblical words speak of union in death and resurrection with Osiris (Egypt) or with Christ (Bible). In Egypt Osiris is the firstfruit of them that slept, in I Cor. 15:20 it is Christ. Can there be any

doubt that the underlying religious ideas are of quite a different order? The distance between them is as great as that between the physical and the ethical.

Here, too, we must take into account that words are stiff, bounded, immovable things, quite insufficient to reproduce the sensitiveness of life. Each word is limited and shut off by its own outlines. Between the one word and the other there is always a line of demarcation perceptible, and a group of words joined to represent a reality of life acts as a mosaic; the little pieces together give the impression of a whole, but close examination shows that each piece has its own border lines, so that they never blend with each other. But life is no mosaic composed of separate pieces; rather is it a picture, since its colours blend without clearly defined limits.

Here we meet a very important consideration. No one can express his thoughts in absolutely adequate words or phrases; there is always a remainder of thought or feeling that is unspeakable. But, though it were possible to put down our whole feeling in words, even then our words would convey the same feeling only to the precisely equal-minded. Human minds are like tuning-forks. The vibration of one produces a like vibration in the other, provided both are tuned alike. An unlike tuned fork will respond in an unlike manner. That means, in the terms of the present subject: The greater the distance,—local, temporal or mental,—between two cultures, religions, races, men and so forth, the greater grows the difficulty of mutual understanding. The Bible arose from a Semitic people in ancient times, and the scholar who is not attuned to the deep religious spirit of the Bible is in continual danger of being informed by the words alone. His penetrating sagacity cannot make up for his impotence to enter into the religious atmosphere of the Bible. Many scholars have been the dupes of that mistake. Misled by the external appearance of words and terms they have failed to take account of the special religious character of Scrip-

ture. For instance, the ancient world was polytheistic; there were gods of the heaven and of the earth, of the mountains and of the sea, of vegetation and of the rain, and so forth. All these gods had their own attributes; in the Old Testament many of these attributes are also applied to Jahve, the God of Israel, on the principles already mentioned. From this many scholars inferred that Jahve also was a nature deity, a conclusion suggested indeed by appearances, but completely in disaccord with the inner tenor of the Old Testament.

Another mistake hinders the understanding of the Bible. Our dogmatic terms are taken from the Bible, but our view of life has been modified since those times, so has the tenor of these ancient words, and we are in danger of putting our contents into the ancient terms. For instance, we use the term "wonder" ordinarily in the sense of Thomas Aquinas, the omission by God of the "second causes." Thus, in our parlance, a wonder belongs to the supernatural as opposed to the natural, that is, to that which has a "natural" cause. And we innocently think that we are in accord with the Scripture. We think so wrongly. An attentive reading will inform us that the word "wonder" in the Scripture has another meaning. The Orientals knew nothing of our idea "natural law" in opposition to "wonder" as a special divine act. For them everything is a divine act, the shower (Job 37:6) as well as the swimming axe (II Kings 6:6). In Job 37, lightning, thunder, snow, whirlwind, frost, clouds, and so forth, are all called "wonders." "Wonder," in Biblical parlance, applies to all that impresses the human mind, to anything majestic and powerful. The march through the Red Sea is an instructive instance. Exodus 14:21, 22 shows two conceptions side by side. According to one, Moses stretched his hand over the sea and the waters were divided. According to the other, God caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all the night. The former we call a "wonder," the latter a natural fact.

That distinction does not get at the ancient mind, and when in Exodus 15:11 God is sung as "doing wonders" the poet does not view one act as distinct from the other, but sees in both the mighty, helping hand of God.

After these considerations we may say a few words about the Bible as the book of revelation in its relation to other religions that use the same terms in a different sense. We have already seen that the formal connection of the Bible with other literature does not necessarily imply a derogation from the divine character of Scripture apart from all other writings. But on the other hand the widespread and popular idea that divine intervention concerns only the Israelitic and Christian religions, while all others are left to chance, is untenable. Setting aside the superficial opinion that on this supposition a great—the greatest—part of the world is put beyond the divine rule, both the religions of revelation would then have borrowed their material in part from a province of chance. The true view, as we have seen, is: The ancient world is the mine whence Israel and Christendom dug the gold-ore out of which they formed the precious metal of ethical monotheism. The materials lay in the depths of the earth, concealed under dust and stones. Their value was unconceived. To be the bearer of the monotheistic conception presupposes a certain degree of culture. The notion "world," "universe," must exist in order that the idea "creator of the world" may be conceived. This presupposed culture was not produced by Israel. Little nations do not produce great cultures. These are always the product of the contact of different peoples or races. The history of the world is a continual repetition of the same process. One people is overthrown by another and the subduing people absorbs the spiritual properties of the subdued. That process took place between the Sumerians and the Semites in the Euphrates valley, between the Pelasgians and the Hellenes in Greece, between the Romans and the Goths in Latium, between the Canaan-

ites and the Hebrews in Canaan. The Canaanites had borrowed their spiritual culture from the Babylonians, and when Israel took their place in the Holy Land the Israelites assumed the world-spread Babylonian culture. The Mediterranean world produced the spiritual culture needed to make Israel capable of fulfilling its vocation. For Israel *had* a high calling, to be the bearer of ethical monotheism. And I recognize a divine providence in this, that the great nations consumed their vital force in preparing the place for the elected people and in producing the conditions under which it could perform its spiritual task. The people of Israel could begin with fresh vigour where the great ancient nations had exhausted their strength. It is the old story of the birds who held a contest in high-flying. The wren seated himself on the back of the eagle and when the great birds were wearied out the wren flew up and won the match.

So the appearance of Israel on the scene was, in a sense, a "fulness of the time" (Gal. 4:4), a result. And this result becomes by God's guidance, in its turn, a starting-point for a new development. Israel's task is not only to predict but to bring forth the Messiah; again a "fulness of the time." And that result was, once more, the point of departure for a new epoch, the *parousia* of Christ.

Thus all history, profane as well as sacred, is implicated in the development of revelation. Revelation does not exclude history, it includes it. It is the point of concentration for the history of the world. For from the religious point of view, Israel and Christianity are points of concentration. The calling of Israel is so far from being an exception to the previous course of events and surrounding history that rather the whole process of history seems ordered for the appearance of Israel, while the history of Israel in its turn aims at the Messiah.

The idea of "revelation" applied to history implies no disowning of the mutual coherence of facts sacred or profane, but rather clarifies that connection, and the dis-

tinction between special revelation and universal has good sense when it is taken not as a contrast but as a synthesis. There is but one revelation, the revelation of God in Christ, and that revelation directs the whole history of the world.

With this held in mind we shall be guarded from the mistake of distrusting the comparative study of religions as hostile by nature to the absoluteness of Christianity and also from the ingenuousness of mingling our Western ideas with Eastern forms of speech.

A Factor in World Fellowship

The Christian Endeavour Movement

By Francis E. Clark, D.D., LL.D.,

President of the United Society of Christian Endeavour and of The World's Christian Endeavour Union.

Thirty-six years ago a few young people at Portland, Maine, gathered in their pastor's parlour and formed themselves into a society under his leadership. It was a modest, inconspicuous gathering, unheralded in the Portland papers, unrecognized at first even by the majority of the church which it was intended to serve.

To-day societies with the same name and pledge and working principles are found in every land with the exception perhaps of two or three South American Republics, and to a greater or less extent in every evangelical Protestant denomination. Eighty thousand societies with an aggregate membership of four millions are on the rolls of organization. Since the beginning no less than sixteen millions of young people have belonged to the society; most of them, of course, as they have grown older, have passed on to other church activities. Probably two millions and a half or more of the present active members are found in America, though the society is scarcely less strong, proportionately, in Great Britain and her colonies, particularly in some of the Australian commonwealths. The literature of Christian Endeavour has been translated into at least fifty languages and there are some forty weekly or monthly publications in half as many tongues devoted to its ideals and its interests. In many missionary lands the Society has done especially effective work.

India claims 1,900 societies, China over a thousand, while the Japan Union is striving to double its numbers in a twelvemonth, and with good prospects of success.

The wide acceptance of the Society by the denominations is one of the surprises of its history. Though it began in a Congregational church, several other denominations now surpass that church in the number of their Christian Endeavour adherents. In the United States the Northern Presbyterian Churches maintain the lead they have long held. The societies are now multiplying rapidly in the Southern Presbyterian Church, whose General Assembly very recently has cordially approved of the movement.

Next to the Presbyterians, in the number of their societies, come the Disciples of Christ.

The Baptists come next, and then the Congregationalists, in the actual number of their Christian Endeavourers, but are surpassed by others in the proportionate number of their Endeavour societies.

The United Brethren, German Reformed, Dutch Reformed, Methodist Protestant, and many smaller denominations, have practically no other young people's society.

Throughout the world doubtless the various bodies of Methodists lead in the number of their Christian Endeavour societies, since the Primitive Methodist and the United Methodist churches of England, the Irish Methodists and all the Methodists of Australia, formerly divided into six denominations, have heartily adopted the society.

The 500 societies in Germany are all in the Lutheran Church, as are the many vigorous organizations of Norway, while there are at least a thousand societies, and some of the best, in the English-speaking Lutheran churches of America.

There are few Christian Endeavour societies in the Episcopal churches of America, though the number is increasing, and such a leader as Dr. Floyd Tomkins is one of the heartiest advocates of the movement.

In Great Britain a Church of England Christian Endeavour Union has been formed, composed of several hundred societies, all in co-operation and sympathy with the British National Union. It is needless to name the more than fifty denominations which have practically if not formally endorsed the movement.

In the early days a common convention feature was to hear representative ministers of various faiths tell in five minute speeches how exactly the society fitted their denominational tenets and polity. The reason of this unanimity doubtless was because the society was based on broad fundamental Christian principles and practices which were equally acceptable to all evangelical bodies; —principles and practices which are all summed up in the first clause of the Christian Endeavour pledge: "Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I will strive to do whatever He would like to have me do." The pledge is comprehensive but modest. The members do not promise great accomplishments but they promise to strive, to try, to endeavour, in Christ's strength, to do His will. The weakest and humblest who is sincere can take such a pledge.

In some things the new society was particularly fortunate. Its name has been in its favour during all the years since its organization,—"The Young People's Society of Christian Endeavour" fully describing its purpose and the scope of its activities. In its first word it recognizes the *young*, and it always, from the first day of the first society, has tried to put the burden of the organization, the meetings, the committees, the union efforts, upon young shoulders. It has recognized their ability, their devotion and their willingness to serve, and so has discovered in ten times ten thousand cases, the young people to themselves and to the churches. The pastors have stood by as sympathetic advisers and helpers, but where they have attempted to lead all the meetings, as a few, especially in Great Britain, have done, or have considered

themselves the "bosses" of every activity, the societies have almost uniformly failed, for they soon cease to be young people's societies.

The fact that it is a young *people's* society as well as a *young* people's society, has added to its wide influence and acceptance. The sexes have been brought together under influences that appealed to the best that is in them; each supplements the work and the inspirations of the other, and, though at the beginning the society had to endure the jibe of being a "Courting Endeavour Society," it has long outlived the easy joke suggested by its initials. Many wise men, like the late William T. Stead, believe that one large count in its favour is that it brings so many earnest and devoted young men and women together and is the promoter of so many happy marriages.

The third important word in the name of the organization is also significant. It is a *society*. A sect is something cut off. It cannot be universal. A local or denominational name must necessarily be limited in its appeal. A "society" is wide enough to include the people of the whole world. The most significant words of the title, "Christian Endeavour," are also fitted for a world-wide movement. There is no suggestion of division in the words. They are as large as Christianity, and as inclusive as Christlike effort. Nothing of any description that is possible for young Christians to accomplish or even to attempt, in the Master's name, is beyond the scope of the society or foreign to its purposes. On this account their activities have been legion and their enterprise, ingenuity and resourcefulness in devising plans and methods of service, adapted to the needs of many countries, and a multitude of differing communities, have long surprised and delighted me.

I have often been asked where the name "Christian Endeavour" originated, and I am quite unable to answer with certainty. I have learned that Edward Eggleston ministered to a church of Christian Endeavour (the

Church of the Best Licks), and that there was once a society of Christian Endeavour in a deaf and dumb asylum in New England, but whether I had heard of either of these before February, 1881, I cannot tell, or whether the name was entirely original or the result of unconscious cerebration. It matters little, however. The members of the Christian Endeavour Society are far from deaf, and certainly not dumb, and the name expresses their high and persistent purpose. Above all, it is a name so universal in its scope and so free from sectarian or doctrinal suggestion, that all who will can adopt it without disloyalty to any church or creed. Some denominations when they do not care to take the simple name Christian Endeavour, have united a denominational name with it, like the Epworth League of Christian Endeavour of Canada.

The constitution of the society, as ordinarily adopted, is equally adapted to all denominations and all nations, for its great purpose is to make each group of young people first of all faithful and efficient in the work and worship of its own church. This makes it possible for members of the societies to have fellowship with their comrades in other denominations and other nations, for no denomination will tolerate a society that does not insist on the loyalty of its members to their own church, however indifferent it may be to their fellowship with young people of other churches. Indeed, the idea that loyalty and fellowship are not antagonistic is of recent birth, and is still practically denied in some quarters. This is the real reason that one or two denominations have held aloof from the Christian Endeavour movement. They have started rival young people's societies of their own, and have practically forbidden their members to unite with others in Christian Endeavour unions. In mission lands this aloofness has been particularly deplorable, for it has divided the forces of young Christians to a large extent, has unnecessarily emphasized the divisions of

Protestantism, and has exalted denominational names and shibboleths among native Christians to whom they were utterly unmeaning.

This spirit of growing fellowship and goodwill has fostered and has been fostered as well by all such union movements as the Christian Endeavour Society. The times were ripe for them. They were inevitable, and all the sectarians in the world, though they can hinder them, cannot stop them. The chief means of promoting the fellowship of the young people of the churches has been the union meetings and the conventions—state, national and international. In considering how the fellowship of Christian young people has been promoted, I cannot do better than to call attention in some detail to the unions and to some of these great conventions. They are symptomatic of the times as well as of this movement.

A dozen societies, after a few years, found themselves in the same town. What more natural than that their members should wish to get together for mutual exchange of plans, for inspiration and encouragement? The first local union was formed in New Haven, Connecticut, in 1885. The example was contagious. Endeavourers in other cities found they wanted the same thing, and Christian Endeavour unions sprang up as if by magic, in every city and town of any considerable size, throughout the country. Young people in other countries found the same needs and the same way of meeting them, and now in Berlin and Christiania and Paris and Tokyo and Osaka and Cape Town and Madras and Glasgow and Belfast and Budapest and London and Sydney and Rio de Janeiro and a thousand other cities, local Christian Endeavour unions are found with their regular quarterly or monthly meetings, which bring together young people of from five to twenty-five denominations. Soon county, state and provincial unions were formed, with annual meetings to bring to a larger constituency the same blessings of fellowship that the local unions conferred upon the Endeavour-

ers of a single city or town. It was not long before almost every considerable country had its *national* Christian Endeavour organization.

Then the European societies organized the European Union, embracing all the societies on the Continent as well as those of Great Britain and Ireland, just as the United Society of Christian Endeavour, the progenitor of all the others, brought together in this new communion the Christian young people of the United States, Canada and Mexico. At length the demand for the widest possible fellowship compelled, in 1895, the formation of the *World's* Christian Endeavour Union, a Union which holds its meetings once in four or five years, and which has gone as far afield as Agra, India, for its convention city. The relation of all these unions to the local society is simply sympathetic and inspirational. They exert no authority, demand no dues or fees, or allegiance of any kind, always insisting that the church and pastor are the supreme authority for every Christian Endeavour society. Thus the loyalty of the young people of all denominations is secured, though not at the expense of their fellowship.

Again the guiding hand of Providence is seen in the great conventions which have been the outgrowth of the movement and which have so largely promoted the fraternal relations of young people. It is needless to say that such conventions were never dreamed of at the beginning. They seem to have been a necessary and inevitable outgrowth of the society and its principles. There was a get-together-ness in the idea of Christian young people having the same name, principles and pledges. It created the demand for these conventions and made the members of the societies ready to spend their brief holidays and their scanty cash in attending these religious meetings which to many would seem so devoid of attractions,—meetings which began with an early morning prayer meeting and ended with a consecration service. But little more than a year after the formation of the first society,

when there were scarcely a dozen like it in the world, the first convention was held in the birthplace of Christian Endeavour. These conventions increased in size and power, with every year, until after eleven years, in 1892, Madison Square Garden could not begin to hold the throngs that desired to attend the national convention of that year. All the churches in the vicinity had to be requisitioned, and open-air services were improvised to take care of the overflows.

It was the first vast young people's religious convention, I suppose, in the world's history, unless the marshalling of the young Crusaders in the twelfth century could be called a convention. The Endeavourers, however, set before themselves no impossible or useless task, and started on no disastrous journey, but simply strove by united prayer and praise and consultation, and by listening to the addresses of their elders, to "increase their mutual acquaintance and to make themselves more useful in the service of God." This was the definition of the object of the society as set forth in the first constitution and adopted by nearly ten times ten thousand societies since. "To increase their mutual acquaintance" meant at first only the acquaintance of the members of a single society. A good Providence expanded the content of that definition until it took in young people in practically every denomination and every nation.

The people of New York were quite incredulous, so far as they knew anything about it, concerning the expected size of the convention of 1892. When told that there might be five thousand delegates, they scoffed. As a matter of fact there were more nearly 25,000. One hotel keeper offered to take in the whole convention in addition to his other guests! One minister assured me that the convention would not make a ripple in New York's busy life, that conventions came and went and no one knew that they were there. But when the earnest, bright-faced young people thronged the thoroughfares, crowded the

street-cars, taxed the capacity of the New York Central railroad, as President Chauncey Depew acknowledged in an impromptu speech before the convention, and made the air vocal with their songs, and the streets bright with their fluttering badges, even New York did take notice. The reporters of a cynical morning paper that came to scoff remained to praise if not to pray, and the other papers gave columns and even pages to the convention.

But the New York convention was by no means the largest of the series. Three years later 56,425 delegates were actually registered at the Boston Convention of 1895. Never before or since has Boston received so many visitors in a single week, or made such elaborate preparations for them. All the railway stations within twenty miles of the city were decorated with Christian Endeavour colours, and each of the great department stores seemed to try to outdo all others in the elaborateness of their welcome, as indicated by a profusion of bunting and designs in staff and terra cotta. The city fathers even made the unprecedented concession of allowing two tents, seating ten thousand people each, to be pitched on the sacred Common, while a score of churches and the huge Mechanics Building were also requisitioned for various meetings. More than twenty-eight thousand of these delegates, fully half the whole number, were from outside the State of Massachusetts, and the commingling of these tens of thousands representing every State in the Union and every Protestant denomination, made it one great fellowship meeting from beginning to end.

The thought of fealty to one's own church, however, was not absent from the meeting, for one afternoon, as is the custom in all such conventions, was set apart for denominational rallies in some twenty-five different halls and churches. Some of these rallies were attended by thousands, and in many cases it was said that more young people of these denominations came together than ever assembled under one roof before. Still, while denomina-

tional tenets were, of course, never ignored, the prevailing note of the convention was "in essentials unity, in unessentials liberty, in all things charity."

Two years later the convention met in San Francisco, and more than 25,000 crossed the mountains to attend it. When an aged president of a transcontinental railway was approached by our general secretary, and told that train accommodations would be needed for ten thousand delegates, he shook his trembling finger in the secretary's face, and said oracularly, "Young man, don't you believe it. Cut those figures right in two. I know what conventions are, and that they are never half as large as we are told in advance they will be." As a consequence, entirely inadequate railway accommodations were made for the delegates; long lines of excursion trains, scores in number, were held up, and many were nine and ten days in crossing the continent, while a famine seemed to desolate every restaurant along the route. It must be acknowledged that the exceedingly cheap excursion fares accounted in part for these crowds, and now that the Interstate Commerce laws allow little or no reduction, the cost prevents many from attending distant conventions who would otherwise go. However, the state and county conventions are constantly growing in size and importance, numbering from 300 to 3,000 delegates in attendance, and the aggregate number of Christian Endeavour convention-goers is rapidly increasing. At the last Pennsylvania State Convention, held last July in Harrisburg, more than 3,000 delegates registered, representing forty-six different denominations. How is it possible for these thousands of young men and women from more than two-score denominations to come together without seeing that Christianity is bigger than any sect, and without an enlarged respect and love for all who name the name of Christ?

About the same time, the Massachusetts State Convention brought nearly 3,000 delegates to Salem for the same sort of joyous three days' fellowship gathering. In Massa-

chusetts, "Patriots' Day," the 19th of April, which has taken the place of the old Fast Day, is celebrated in every county of the State by an Endeavour mass meeting of the county union. In the more populous counties from 2,000 to 3,000 assemble every year for these one-day conventions, thus bringing back to the old Bay State something of the lost religious significance of Fast Day.

Some of the foreign conventions have been even more significant, so far as the fellowship of the societies is concerned, for there representatives of many nations are brought together as they cannot well be in English-speaking America. A World's convention held in London in 1900 was a memorable gathering, not only or chiefly because of the 50,000 people that attended it, but because nearly every country was represented and because of the interesting interdenominational character of the speakers' platform. For instance, at one meeting, held in the Alexandra Palace, five noted leaders of the churches spoke each for his own denomination, and each one also for the broadest interdenominationalism. It was the day when the greatest preachers flourished in the metropolis. The Bishop of London, the eloquent Dr. Creighton, spoke for the Church of England, Joseph Parker of the City Temple for the Congregationalists, Hugh Price Hughes for the Methodists, Dr. Greenough for the Baptists, and Dr. Watson for the Presbyterians.

The note of fellowship and Christian fraternity was sounded by every speaker, though Dr. Parker rather startled us at the beginning of his address, only to show with what flying colours he could extricate himself from a cavity of his own digging. As chairman of the meeting, I had naturally introduced Dr. Creighton as the "Bishop of London." Dr. Parker was the next speaker, and shaking his shaggy locks at me he roared, "Mr. Chairman, I understood you to introduce the last speaker as the Bishop of London. I had an impression that I was the Bishop of London. When a minister has stood in one

pulpit for twenty-five years, preaching the gospel every week to great congregations, he has some right to be called the Bishop of London!" This was anything but a brotherly introduction to his speech, and Congregationalists were inclined to hide their heads at the seeming bombast. But Dr. Parker recovered himself as he knew so well how to do, by adding, "But sir, since I have heard the magnificent address of my predecessor on the temper with which we should work together in serving the Master, I have decided that, after all, he has the better right to be called the Bishop of London."

In 1896 the World's Convention was held in Geneva, Switzerland, and its fellowship features were emphasized by the fact that parts of the programme were printed in twelve different languages, and at the consecration meeting responses were made in twenty-nine or thirty different languages, the mother tongues of as many different groups of delegates, though most of them understood French, German or English,—the chief languages of the meetings.

Late in 1909 the World's Convention was held in Agra, India, where great preparations were made for the accommodation, largely in tents, of 4,000 native Christians, 400 missionaries, and other delegates from many lands. Even more than at other conventions the fellowship of the denominations and the nations was here demonstrated. Two large audience tents were used, one to accommodate the delegates who spoke English, and the other for the Hindustani speakers, the two leading languages of the convention. Though most understood one or the other of these languages, the natives of many parts of India, Burma and Ceylon were present. Before the convention closed, each expressed his love for the Master in his own language or dialect, and then all of the two great audiences, united for the occasion, joined in repeating the twenty-third Psalm, each in his own native tongue. Then in the Lord's Prayer thirty-two different languages blended as one, while, to close the service, the great audience arose

and again in thirty-two languages and dialects, to the old tune of Dennis, sang

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love."

It was a thrilling sight and sound. We felt that Pentecost had come again. This was a "gift of tongues" which all could understand, and in which all could join. Such scenes have been repeated on a smaller scale thousands of times, for the Endeavour Conventions have as striking features in China, Japan, Africa and India, as in America, Great Britain or Australia and even more picturesque.

This emphasis on fellowship is by no means confined to the conventions large or small. In sparsely settled communities a single society may serve several churches, though as a rule every church has its own society, loyally devoted to its interests. But circumstances may alter cases, as in Collegeport, Texas, where a "Federated Society of Christian Endeavour," so-called, is said to be composed of members of fourteen different denominations.

The *work* of the unions, even more than their meetings, bring young people together in the fellowship of service. Many large unions, like that of Chicago, with its hundreds of societies, have many departments, such as the evangelistic department, the hospital, prison and sailors' departments, whose particular forms of service can be judged from their names. Through these different lines of Christian work, young men and women from many churches unite to visit and help the inmates of prisons and hospitals, the sailors in port, the soldiers in the barracks. Other unions have special missions for men in the car-barns, and life-saving stations, for children's fresh-air homes, which they support, for soldiers in the camps, and many other forms of endeavour, which unite the members in a blessed community of work.

The London Union, with its six or seven hundred societies, and the Liverpool Union as well, pay especial attention to "Floating Endeavour" as the sailors' societies

are called, and many thousands of comfort bags and tens of thousands of letters are sent by the Endeavourers to their comrades on the sea.

Especially in these war-times the united efforts of the Endeavourers of Great Britain and Germany are turned to aid and comfort the seamen of the navies and the soldiers in the trenches.

One of the most significant meetings I ever attended was in Cape Town, South Africa, a few months after the close of the Boer War. The Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa and the English-speaking churches both had many Christian Endeavour societies, but the war, as is well known, estranged the races in a bitter and cruel way. Thousands of Boer prisoners of war had been sent to St. Helena and Ceylon and the Bermudas. In all these prison camps the Dutch soldiers formed many Christian Endeavour societies which held their weekly meetings, formed unions of their own, carried on their quarterly conventions, and even published a little paper called *The Striver*.

The first union service of the Dutch and English of any kind after the war was the meeting to which I have referred. I had been in South Africa a few months before the war broke out as well, and knew something of the intense bitterness of feeling that then existed between the races. When on my second visit I entered the hall of the Adderly Street Dutch Reformed Church, I could scarcely believe my eyes and ears as I saw the mottoes of welcome and fraternity in the two languages which adorned the walls, and heard the brotherly words of welcome from the officers of the two unions, Dutch and English.

In the course of the evening, as in India, we all repeated the twenty-third Psalm and then joined in the Lord's Prayer, the two languages mingling harmoniously in the great petition of love and forgiveness. Most marvellous of all, before the meeting was over, all stood, joined hands, and sang, some in Dutch and some in English, the same familiar hymn of brotherhood,

"Blest be the tie that binds."

In the audience I saw many young Boers just released from far-off prison camps, and many young Britishers who had recently worn the uniform of their king. The memory of that scene has given me courage and hope for the speedy union of young Christians of many lands that are now "enemy countries," when the present cruel war is over.

A most hopeful movement was started in Great Britain a few years before the war began, for establishing "Christian Endeavour Holiday Homes," where members of the societies could enjoy a delightful two weeks' holiday at a moderate expense, and in the best company. Four such homes are established in Great Britain, two in Germany and one in France, and, before the war interfered with these brotherly courtesies, English Endeavourers entertained at their Holiday Homes German, French and Russian Endeavourers, while the Endeavourers across the Channel intended to reciprocate these invitations, thus establishing an *entente cordiale* between the young holiday seekers of many lands.

At the last national British Convention I attended (1914, in London) several German, Dutch and French delegates were present, by special invitation, and the German young men told the great audience at the closing meeting in Queen's Hall, with voices broken with emotion, how much they had enjoyed the blessed fellowship of these convention days. This was in June, 1914. Alas, in two months the awful world-war broke out.

But the war must some time come to an end. Then may these sundered ties be united, and brave hearts beat as one again. Then may the Christian Endeavour Society have its part,—the part for which we are hoping and praying and planning, in bringing together once more, and in a lasting fellowship, the young men and women who, in many lands, have taken the Prince of Peace as their Master, and who in many languages have promised "to *strive* to do as He would like to have them do."

The Heresy That Hinders

By Edward Tallmadge Root,
Field Secretary to the Massachusetts Federation of Churches.

The most harmful heresy is not the one which perverts the articles of faith, but that which paralyses the activities of faith! For life is larger than liturgy: Christian practice is more fundamental than church polity: the most vital verities are those that constrain conduct rather than constitute creeds.

The most dangerous form of any heresy is the unformulated heresy. A fallacy once stated can be tested and refuted. Assumed by aggressive advocates, it is apt to be accepted by all. Its opponents are at a disadvantage. It is not easy to assail an atmosphere. He who has to fight "as one that beateth the air," presents a sorry figure.

Now, something evidently is hindering the practical movements which every thoughtful Christian recognizes as right, necessary, and vitally important. One of these movements calls upon the churches to take up social service, to put the mighty motives of faith back of sorely needed reforms, moral, industrial, hygienic, and social; to recognize that their task is not only and none the less to save souls, but also to Christianize community and commonwealth. At the same time, the disgrace and disadvantages of division are shaming the churches to seek at least a practical unity; and when to this end they ask: What can we do together?—the most obvious opportunities are afforded by these new lines of social action. So strong is the combination of these two motives, that

church federation should be what John R. Mott calls it: "This triumphant and inevitable movement." Yet this is precisely what it is not,—as yet! A thousand dead or dying federations strew the country, though, thank God, enough are alive to prove the vitality of the principle. Somehow, there is an undertow. What is it that hinders?

"Denominationalism, of course!" Such a reply is ready: but the astonishing fact is that, except for a few high-churchmen in a few communions, loyalty to denominational principles plays no part in preventing united action. In more than a dozen years' experience as a promoter of inter-church co-operation, I have found it as easy to bring together men of different, as men of the same, denomination; as hard to persuade congregations of the same faith to make sacrifices for the larger good as churches of conflicting creeds. If any 'ism interferes, it is sheer institutionalism! And gradually it has been forced upon me that the real undertow is the current conception of the nature and functions of the Church, a conception assumed rather than formulated.

We owe much to those who, in the effort to secure the co-operation of all social agencies, have attempted to define the functions of each, and among them of the Church. They are compelling us to formulate our views, and bringing to light the significance of our assumptions. One of the most admirable of these statements is that of President Kenyon L. Butterfield of the Massachusetts Agricultural College:

> "The Country Church is to maintain and enlarge both individual and community ideals, under the inspiration and guidance of the religious motive, and to help rural people incarnate these ideals in personal, family, political and social life."

This is revolutionary, for the relation of the Church to "community ideals" has been ignored; and its obligations to "help incarnate" any ideals denied. Those who protest against any social action on the part of the Church apparently hold that it may inspire but not execute; set

up ideals, but not set tasks. I once heard the theory expressed in a charming address, entitled *The Keeper of the Springs*, which compared the Church to a man who devoted to forestry his large estate among the hills, taking pleasure in the thought that by thus maintaining the even flow of the streams, he was making possible the whirr of busy mills and the navigation of deep rivers far away.

'Tis a pity to tear up so beautiful a picture! But experience constrains me to deny the whole conception; and to assert that the practical results of this theory are such that there is today a rising revolt against it, which demands its open refutation.

THE RESULTS OF THE THEORY.

Upon the life of the Church it has had disastrous effects. For what follows if it be true? Logically it compels us to say to church-members: In order to carry out the ideals of the Church, in order to do anything practical, you must go outside the Church! And, to a large extent, is not this precisely what has been said and done? The practical work of Christianity in our midst is mainly done, not by the churches, but by civil institutions or by voluntary societies, carefully kept non-denominational and even non-religious. This is true not only of education, charity, temperance, and moral reforms, but even of essentially religious issues, like the observance of the Lord's Day, or organized provision for the three-fold nature of young men and young women. So strong is the tendency, that when need is felt for extraordinary effort in the fundamental task of the Church, that of bringing men to personal acceptance of the Christian life, the usual method is to organize a temporary committee of individuals, erect a great tabernacle outside of the churches, and to engage an evangelist whose first step is to draw a delighted crowd by unsparing criticism of the Church and its ministry for inefficiency, if for nothing worse.

Yet those who carry on all these lines of reform and social service are men and women whom the Church has trained and inspired, and who in the main are still church-members. A recent investigation revealed the fact that of 1,012 social workers, 71 per cent were church-members, and that the proportion was still higher in the case of Social Settlements and Associated Charities, being respectively 88 and 92 per cent. The general assumption that these activities belong outside the church makes the facts all the more significant: and the facts refute the assumption. So closely are these activities related that only church-trained men and women usually apply or are found fitted for them.

But it may be said: What does it matter so long as the things are done? It is at least a serious matter that the Church as an institution thereby suffers. It is as an institution that the Church today is weak, however strong it may be as an influence. With the public generally it loses credit and prestige that justly belongs to it. Its own members lack interest because as church-members they have so few definite tasks. To maintain a mere preaching station only a few laymen are needed as finance committee or ushers. The small and struggling church is really the most successful, for it interests the largest proportion of its membership; but this means that its whole energy is absorbed in the struggle for existence. The best opportunity for lay activity, voluntary teaching in the Sunday School, is now being limited and lessened by the wholesome demand for a higher standard of religious education. If the church is to thrive as an institution, commanding the interest and active loyalty of its members, it must find for them within itself many men's jobs and work worthy of women. It must be able to offer to eager applicants, filled with the new social spirit, something better than to "care for the altar-cloths,"—to cite the incident told by Miss Jane Addams.

The hindrance becomes most obvious when the churches,

moved by a growing sense of their unity, attempt to work together. Then they find that the larger part of those activities which would naturally lend themselves to inter-church effort are not only pre-empted by societies of individuals but also regarded as improper for the churches to touch. This is the main reason for the slow development of church federation.

Moreover, does not religion itself suffer, as well as its institutions? Its supreme command is two-fold: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart; and thy neighbour as thyself." What God hath joined together, man may not safely put asunder. And the effect of insisting that all practical effort to obey the second command shall be done in organizations separate from those that cultivate obedience to the first, must be to distort and maim both. Faith inevitably loses in practicality. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen." Is it not due to this divorce, that Protestantism has tended to put emphasis upon intellectual acceptance of creeds? And that now, when less value is attached to them, many fail to see any importance in religion?

But society suffers as well as the Church. All forms of social service lose something of that depth, tenderness, and fervour which come from the religious motive. The test works both ways, as the Apostle recognizes: "Hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and do His commandments." Even well-meant efforts for mankind tend to become cold, technical, supercilious. Still more obvious is their lack of any unifying principle. Each charity or reform seems to its supporters all-important, and of minor importance to those interested in other lines. Philanthropy, or democracy, in general, is too vague to inspire enthusiasm or to co-ordinate the needs which it includes. It is true that today social workers are increasingly consulting, co-operating, and seeking a comprehensive principle; but that very effort

is bringing them back, as we shall see, to recognize the significance of religion. All this has had the very practical result of producing the multiplicity of organizations of which people complain, with their burdensome demand upon money, time, and strength. Because the existing voluntary institutions, the churches, were not prepared to co-operate wholesale, their members, as givers and workers, have been compelled to co-operate piecemeal; and so, society, already overburdened thanks to denominational divisions with at least twice the number of churches required, has been compelled to duplicate also its machinery for social action.

These detrimental results, although only vaguely realized, are evidently causing a revolt against the theory.

REVOLT AGAINST THE THEORY.

Is not the unsparing and increasing criticism of the churches in itself a proof that society is changing its theory of the function of the Church? All present day criticisms assume that the churches ought to provide for every newly discovered human need, and right every recognized social wrong! The obvious and pertinent reply, that it is the churches which have given ideals, inspiration and the majority of fit workers to every line of social betterment, is no longer accepted as sufficient. No! The churches themselves must do these things, or they are regarded as socially inefficient and recreant to their Divinely-given mission! If the churches did half of the things which they are criticized for not doing, they would hold a larger place in society than ever; they would be beyond question the most important of social institutions!

Further and more concrete proof that society today regards the churches as organizations for practical work is found in the multiplying and increasingly insistent appeals for their aid by every betterment movement. The Country Life Commission appointed by President Roosevelt laid the chief responsibility for rural betterment

upon the country church, and a "new Country Church movement" and literature has resulted. A new era of rapid progress in temperance legislation opened when the Anti-Saloon League organized "the Church against the Saloon." The Board of Health of perhaps the most secular city in the world, New York, in one of its bulletins, said: "The spirit of social *religion* requires the lowering of the death-rate." The Massachusetts Medical Society's official organ proposed a joint committee with the state Federation of Churches, because what is increasingly recognized as the chief work of the profession, prevention of disease, requires the formation of public opinion, for which the aid of the churches is indispensable. The secretary of a society for sex-hygiene, in his eagerness to confer with an official of the same Federation of Churches, telephoned and finally travelled to the latter's summer home to say in substance: "Our assumption that mere information is sufficient is mistaken. We need your help to bring to bear moral and religious motives." In the sensible campaign to prevent fires on the Fourth of July, one Chief appealed to every pastor, priest and rabbi in the city to speak to his congregation on the subject the preceding sabbath. Such examples might be multiplied indefinitely.

On the other hand, is it not also true that the churches are abandoning the old theory? The Social Service Programs adopted by the leading denominations and federations, local and national, can have no other meaning. Such a program issued by one state Federation calls upon every church to organize a social service committee, co-operating with other churches through the local federation and with other agencies, to give systematic relief in congregation and community and furnish friendly visitors to the Charity Organization or jointly support a visiting nurse; to interest its membership in giving every child protection, education, and recreation; to welcome foreign groups in the community and teach

them English and citizenship; to support the movements to secure to all workers by law one day's rest in seven, reasonable hours of labour, and a minimum wage; to study and promote law-enforcement, not merely in respect to drinking and vice, but also in relation to housing, health, factory conditions and child-labour; and finally to educate its membership on these questions by study-classes and discussion-groups. A platform of sixteen social principles for which "the churches must stand" was unanimously adopted at the first meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in 1908, and reaffirmed in 1912; and has since been adopted by the religious liberals not included in its membership. In 1916 it inaugurated a comprehensive "Movement for the Conservation of Human Life." The greater social problem of international peace has been recognized by a special Commission of the Council, and by the World Alliance of the Churches for the Promotion of International Friendship, the two uniting in an appeal to every local church to organize a "peacemakers' committee." Indeed, it looks as if every good-sized church would soon have to have a score of committees to take up all the important lines of activity which experts say are part of its task, and for which they are eager to furnish plans and advice.

Nor is this expansion of functions confined to Protestant churches. A recent Roman Catholic book, *The Priest and Social Action*, officially approved, sets forth the work done and encouraged in that communion. The author urges the organization of the laity for such work, and says that the priest who does everything himself is like a man who "keeps dogs and does his own barking."

These obvious and multiplying facts mean nothing less than a revolution in the activities, organization, and fundamental conception of the Church. If the theory that the function of the Church is merely to give ideals and inspiration be correct, this revolution must be opposed

and averted. If the revolution is inevitable and desirable, we must change our theory. Is that theory then sound doctrine or heresy? I maintain that it is the latter, and that Scripture as well as recent church history furnish a complete refutation of the theory.

REFUTATION OF THE THEORY.

"It is not fit that we should forsake the Word of God and serve tables" (Acts 6:2). I have no doubt that this verse has been often used as a conclusive argument against the broadening of the function of the Church. But who were those who said "we"? And what alternative to their own serving of tables did they propose? The Apostles rightly held that they could not continue to bear the burden of the daily distribution, a task constantly increasing with the multiplying number of disciples. But why? Not because it was not a proper task even for the leaders of the Church, for it is implied that up to this time they had been attending to it. But because it would prevent their fulfilling their primary and unique function, as eyewitnesses of the facts which were the foundation of the new faith. They recognized that growth demanded development of more complex organization, that the Church must have new organs and new officers. But they did not say that the newly discovered social needs must be handed over to outside organizations. They did not form a non-religious charity society.

The fallacy which has so long deceived us is due to a confusion of the functions of the pulpit with those of the church, or even of the pastor. Even he may share in practical "service" until it threatens to impair his primary function; and then the remedy is for the Church to add "deacons," servants, to meet each new need. In the Church itself "there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit." "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all gifts of healings? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?"

"Nay, much rather those members of the body which seem to be feeble are necessary." "They are many members, but one body." (I Cor. 12:4, 29, 30, 22, 20.) All forms of Christian service are thus recognized as having a place within the Church. From the standpoint of the New Testament then is it not clearly a heresy to say that there is something in the nature of the Church itself which compels us to take outside of its organized life the practical applications of its faith?

Is that compulsion found in the principle: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's"? The importance of clearly marking the boundary between the realms of Church and of State is indeed great. The latter includes all actions where it is possible to compel obedience by force without violating the sacred rights of human personality. The temptation of the State has been to extend its sphere too far, if not to claim the whole field of human action. The Church by the blood of the martyrs won from the State a wide realm. In turn it tried to use the arm of the State to enforce its will over the whole sphere of human life. But within both Church and State, the principle of liberty, of the sacred rights of personality, has at last won decisive victory. How now is the territory to be divided? Outside of the sphere where government, as the agent of society, may properly say to the individual: You *must* pay and do!—how much belongs to the Church, defined as a voluntary organization securing action by moral and religious motives? And to what institution does the remaining territory belong? If the Church is loyal to her original commission: "Make disciples of all the nations," if with Paul she "wars against every thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to Christ," she must claim the whole territory, and regard it as her duty and purpose to establish that claim by conquest, conquering through spiritual forces alone. She may and does recognize that

other voluntary organizations, appealing to motives lower or higher, but less than the highest, have naturally developed, and accomplish valuable social ends in the territory not yet hers. But she cannot recognize them as other than temporary expedients, partial and imperfect. Her aim must be to win and assimilate them by tact, patience, and the demonstration of her Christlike disinterestedness and the superiority of her motives. The Church alone can meet the needs of society, for she alone can bring the motives of eternity to bear upon the moments of time!

There are, then, only two indispensable institutions, Church and State. It is because they have not risen to their full possibilities that other institutions have multiplied. It is because we have thus substituted multiplicity of organizations for simplicity that social betterment is so expensive, so slow and so fragmentary a process. Its divorce from the Church, for the hardness of our hearts, has been suffered, but from the beginning it hath not been so!

That hardness of heart in the Church herself has been in past ages manifested in the attempt to conquer by using the right of the State to coerce. In the last four centuries her "unhappy divisions" have paralysed her activities, and rendered it necessary to do social work through secular organizations in which Christians could meet on neutral ground. The discovery that, in the sphere of action, unity may be found in advance of unity in the sphere of creed, polity, and ritual, is removing this necessity. Just in proportion as church federation can be established, it will be possible to recover lost ground and extend the sphere of church activities. Of course, its full possibilities will not be realized, nor will it be proper to claim all lines of effort, until the Roman and Greek Catholic Churches are included, yes, and the Jews also. Nor is this an impossibility. When the Federation of Greater Boston sounded Archbishop O'Connell on this point, he said that, while the Catholic Church could not

join a Federation of Churches, he did recognize that there ought to be some association of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, through which the full power of the religious sentiment of the city might be expressed. A foregleam of prophecy was the church-exhibit at the exhibition of "Boston—1915," when the personal representative of the Archbishop declined to take the centre of the room, leaving it for an exhibit typifying the combined religious forces, a temple-of-worship surrounded with its daughter institutions of social service, while on the wall hung a map, locating by incandescent bulbs in three colours all the churches and synagogues, with the motto taken from the Scriptures sacred to all, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come!" When our types of religion thus learn to work together, and not till then, will their light shine, and they be able to lengthen their cords and strengthen their stakes!

Nor is there any need of jealousy or friction between civil and religious institutions. The limits of the sphere of the State, while elastic, are now theoretically well-defined. It has nothing to fear from a proper occupation of the remaining territory by the Church, but rather everything to gain. For the more generally and the more effectively men are made to feel their social obligations by religious motives, the larger will be the sphere in which it will be possible for the State to say: "You must!" without violating the rights of personality, and the less it will need to use the costly machinery of force. So Calvin, writing to Count Tarnow of Poland in 1555, said that where there is "restoration of true piety, there too we see the laws and tribunals in vigour, a greater respect for magistrates, and the people restrained within the bounds of moderation and contentment." Mr. R. Fulton Cutting, in his book, *The Church and Society*, rightly argues that the day has come for a new relation of Church and State. He says that the social programs of the churches too often fail "to recognize that government

is the most potent factor in social uplift" and that "the civil authorities of the democratic state are the tools which the Church herself has so aptly fashioned. She has tried criticizing them, ignoring them, battling with them, capturing them. She has yet to try co-operation with them, recognizing them as her agents for the development of the citizenship which is in Heaven!" (p. 12).

Let none jump to the conclusion that the writer expects or desires an effort on the part of the churches to supplant all other voluntary organizations. They must start where they are, and humbly recognize that, if they are not where they should be, it is mainly due to their own mistakes. Those mistakes they must proceed to remedy, and must cast off the spell of that false theory which has prevented them from setting their membership at work on the real tasks involved in christianizing society as well as individuals. The first effect will be to check the tendency to multiply agencies outside of the churches. The tendency will rather be to utilize the immense latent powers of the churches to meet newly discovered social needs. Outside agencies, officered as they are mainly by church people, will not longer remain aloof and critical, but will increasingly become the agents and expert advisers of the churches, especially when the latter are federated for efficient action. The churches will in time recover more and more of their lost functions and prestige. I am concerned neither to hasten nor to prophesy the end of the process. If once the churches take the right attitude toward each other, toward other institutions civil as well as voluntary, and toward their social tasks, the exact adjustment may confidently be left to the future to determine.

It is the country community that is leading the way. As the late Dr. W. L. Anderson said, it has "a certain ripeness for the Kingdom of God, the final social achievement. A new social order may come with the least opposition and at the lowest cost. Economic and social equality

are no such tantalizing dream as in the city." Moreover the necessity of economizing expense and organization, in meeting the multiplying social needs which rural as well as urban conditions are creating, here compel utilization of existing agencies to the utmost. Two only are indispensable, "church" and "town meeting." The tendency will be to use both more and more. And the country church which hangs on its Christmas tree a present for every man, woman, and child in the community; which provides a visiting nurse and a depot of sick-room supplies; which re-establishes a poor family in a new home completely furnished, before the flames have ceased to devour the old; and knows, seeks, and serves every resident,—and all have been actually done,—will enlist in Christian tasks its whole membership and commend its spiritual message to the whole community!

Samuel Butler The Third

A Theological Rebel

By Moreby Acklom,

Formerly Professor of English Literature in King's College, Windsor, Canada.

In Chambers' *Encyclopaedia of Biography*, under the reference "Samuel Butler" three Samuel Butlers are mentioned. A considerable article is concerned with the author of *Hudibras;* a medium-sized paragraph is allotted to the great headmaster of Shrewsbury School, afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, and a single line records the fact that a third Samuel Butler wrote a biography of the second.

Now, after a few years, time has so revised the values of the three Samuel Butlers to the modern world, that such a comparative allotment of encyclopaedia space appears almost ludicrous. *Hudibras* remains a classic, but steadily drifts towards its permanent anchorage in literature's museum of antiquities: the schoolmaster's name is slowly but surely being covered with dust; while that of the third Samuel Butler is beginning to assail the consciousness of the English-speaking communities from several different directions at once.

In fiction this third Samuel Butler stands out as the author of *The Way of All Flesh*, one of the most remarkable novels of the language; in general literature *Erewhon* and *Erewhon Revisited* shew him the greatest English satirist since Swift,—lacking Swift's force and savageness indeed, but surpassing him in delicacy and in urbanity of humour: in science, though he was a confessed amateur, his four books on evolution, *Life and Habit*, *Evolution*

Old and New, *Unconscious Memory* and *Luck or Cunning* have affected the course of thought so fundamentally, that in *Form and Function*, Professor Russell's recent review of the entire course of comparative biology from Aristotle to the latest German guesses of the present day, Butler is able to claim half a chapter to himself: in criticism, his critical edition of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* is taken seriously by Shakespearean authorities, and his *Authoress of the Odyssey*, presenting brilliantly his theory that the Homeric work was written over a hundred years after Homer's death, in Sicily, by a young woman, is one of the most convincing and fascinating attacks on an entrenched and sanctified tradition our language affords; while in art, the *Alps and Sanctuaries* and *Ex Voto* have opened a mine of formerly inaccessible Italian religious art to English readers, and there are paintings today by him in the National Gallery of British Art, St. John's College, Cambridge, and other public places, and his portrait hangs in the (British) National Portrait Gallery.

Even such multifarious activities, however, did not bound Butler's many-faceted mind; and more than all these to him were music and theology.

As to music, he has left it on record that the second great event in his life (the first being a visit to Rome at the age of eight) was his hearing the music of Händel while still a schoolboy of eighteen.

The solemn grandeur of Händel's work instantly obsessed him, and for the rest of his life he not only preached Händel as the greatest of all composers who had ever lived, but at the age of forty-eight, began to compose music himself in the style of Händel, and later, in collaboration with Henry Festing Jones, published three musical works, *Gavottes, Minuets and Fugues*, in 1885, *Narcissus*, an *oratorio buffo*, in 1888, and *Ulysses*, another oratorio, published posthumously in 1904.

It is worthy of remark that it was while he was re-reading the Odyssey to select passages for the libretto of

Ulysses, that the idea of its feminine authorship, and the obvious discrepancies between the descriptions in the text and the localities fitted to them by tradition struck him with the force of a revelation and sent him hurrying off to Sicily, and later to the Troad, to identify a true *mise-en-scène* for the poem.

I have left Butler's relations with theology to the last, because although he only wrote two books ostensibly concerned with theology, *The Fair Haven* and *God the Known and God the Unknown*, and supposed himself to have done with it quite early in his career, in reality it dogged his progress more faithfully than his love for Händel or Italy did, and forms the substratum of practically all his work, moulding his thought and his methods even when he was least conscious of it.

Moreover, theology was apparently his great failure, as music was certainly his lesser one; and a review of Butler's rebellion against every form of orthodox belief and the consideration of the reasons of his failure where he did fail, and in what he succeeded where he did succeed, will possibly prove suggestive—the more so that Butler's theological side is generally lost sight of altogether in his growing literary and scientific fame.

Butler was a peculiar mixture. His nature was capable of impetuous and yet lasting enthusiasms, but his mind was materialistic and intensely critical and experimental. Added to these contradictory characteristics, a sense of ironical humour almost inconveniently developed, absolute honesty and a profound individualism, made up a personality which was not to find final satisfaction in any beaten track of conventions; and, very luckily for him and for his work, he never had—though often cramped for want of money—to submit to the friction and self-suppression which earning a salary would have meant for him.

He came of a clerical and clever stock. His grandfather, the schoolmaster-bishop, we have already mentioned.

His father, Thomas Butler, Canon of Lincoln, took a first class in Classics, a second in Mathematics at Cambridge, and was known as a learned botanist.

He himself also took a first class in Classics at Cambridge, St. John's being his college, though his interests at the University were by no means confined to his books, as appears from the recollections which his fellow Johnians had of him, and from odds and ends of reminiscence of his college days which appear in his own writings.

It is clear from the obviously autobiographical detail in *The Way of All Flesh* that the tyrannous formality and arid piety of a mid-Victorian evangelical rectory had already given his sensitive and enquiring mind a serious distaste for the established Church—a distaste increased and made resentful by his school experiences at Shrewsbury under Dr. Kennedy.

At Cambridge, we know that the well-meant but antic piety of the "Simeonite" undergraduates—the "Pi-men" of a later day—aroused not only a scorn, but active opposition in Butler, and disgusted him with professional piety of any kind, if his antipietistic nature needed any such stimulant; while the contrast of the intellectual and social freedom which he found there with the repression from which he had hitherto suffered from his father and his schoolmasters made the years behind him seem all the blacker. In fact, he himself records (in the person of Ernest Pontifex) that Cambridge was the first place in which he had ever been happy. After four years of pleasant collegiate life, during which like a hungry colt which has reached a rich pasture, he browsed hungrily hither and thither in life and books, he had to face the fact that in a year or so, according to the programme mapped out for him by his family, he was to be ordained to a curacy in the Church of England.

At this period Butler had no real religious doubts. He disliked the clergy certainly; and, utterly without idealism himself, he had seen only the formal, didactic and

repressive side of the English Church. He did not wish to become a clergyman; but he still took the claims of the Church and of conventional theology for granted.

Combined pressure from his family and heredity was too much for him; and he gave way, going to London to prepare for ordination by learning something about practical pastoral work.

He became lay-worker among the poor of the parish of St. James', Piccadilly, and here encountered the first rock which was to turn the course of his destiny.

Among his duties was that of conducting a Sunday class of biblical instruction for boys. Equipped for this as regards letter-knowledge young Butler certainly was; for all through his writings, by quotation, reference and allusion, he betrays a wide and thorough knowledge of the Bible. But as regards practical life and the real meanings of things he was utterly immature and untaught.

To this young man, full of Latin and Greek, French and Mathematics and coming from a world where all acknowledged the authority and ordinances of the Church, suddenly came the surprising discovery that not all the members of his class were baptized, and—worse and more astonishing still—that those who were baptized shewed absolutely no moral superiority over those who were not.

This appeared to him to demonstrate that a sacrament which, as the prayerbook claimed, should make its recipient a child of God, a member of Christ and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven, could have had no practical effect whatever in these particular instances.

Apart from his inherent tendency to think things out for himself, his relations with his family and instructors had not been such as to make him ready to appeal to them in a difficulty of conscience, and he was thrown back on his own totally inadequate resources for an explanation of this seeming breakdown of the miraculous efficacy which his material and literalistic mind had read

into the ceremony of baptism. After a conscientious and, as far as his powers went, thorough consideration of the difficulty, he came to the conclusion that it was the practice of infant baptism which was at the root of the trouble, and that he could not take Orders in a Church which sanctioned it.

If Butler had remained in England, and come under the influence of a broadminded, understanding man, we should probably have had a famous, if much criticized, Church of England parson, instead of the novelist, artist and satirist; for as I shall presently shew, the bent of his mind remained predominantly theological to the end of his life. As a matter of fact, however, the opposition from his family which his refusal to be ordained brought upon him, as well as his own lack of a definite aim in life, other than to attain as large a measure of freedom as possible, led him to emigrate next year to New Zealand with the idea of sheep-farming there.

Thus at the end of September, 1859, he made his real and permanent break with the old life, for he embarked on the *Roman Emperor* for Port Lyttleton; and the first night on board, for the first time in his life he omitted to say his prayers. He himself says of the incident: "I was not then a sceptic: I had got as far as disbelief in infant baptism, but no further. I felt no compunction of conscience, however, about leaving off my morning and evening prayers—simply I could no longer say them."

This being so, it is not wonderful that the five years which Butler spent ranching on the headwaters of the Rangitata River definitely decided the trend of his future thought and work. When men go out into the wilderness they intensify themselves. Days of solitude and long hours of thought bring what is within them to fruition. In Butler's case, as the need of communion with the Unseen had already left him, his view of life grew definitely and finally materialistic.

The two books which formed his principal reading dur-

ing these years were essentially symbolical of the man; they were the *New Testament* and *The Origin of Species*.

The result of his continued study of the former in a spirit of acute and ingenious criticism, resulted in the writing of a pamphlet, *The Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as contained in the Four Evangelists critically Examined*, which formed the basis of his later work, *The Fair Haven*.

Thus again we have Butler, at a decisive moment, turning in upon himself, instead of reaching outward for assistance.

The Origin of Species, on the other hand, raised in him one of these passionate enthusiasms to which he was liable, and he embraced evolution as a solution of his difficulties as suddenly and fully as he had thrown overboard the Unseen.

It is true that his constitutional inability to take any one else's views on trust later led him to make independent researches into the theories of the earlier evolutionists, Lamarck, Erasmus Darwin and Buffon, and to assail not only the theories but the honesty of Charles Darwin, whom for a while he had looked up to as a new prophet.

His interest in Darwinism led him to write at this time a humorous sketch—*Darwin among the Machines*, which was the nucleus of some of the cleverest chapters of *Erewhon*.

Very much matured in mind and thought by his New Zealand experiences, Butler sold out his sheep-run at a considerable profit and returned to England in 1864, with the idea of taking up painting as his profession; and, in 1872 and 1873 respectively, published *Erewhon* and *The Fair Haven*.

These two books must be considered together, for they fit into each other, and reveal how far their author had travelled since the days when he first began to have doubts on infant baptism.

It should be remembered, too, that *The Fair Haven*,

though published after, was—all but its ironical framework—written before *Erewhon*, and goes far to explain the latter.

The Fair Haven, though in form a defence of the accuracy of the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection and Ascension, is in reality a searching and ingenious attack upon the veracity of the Evangelists.

Taking the Resurrection particularly, and the Ascension subsidiarily, as the crucial miracles of Our Lord, by which the validity of all the other miracles must stand or fall, under a grave mask of candid enquiry he does his best to shew the weakness of the position of the Christian Church, and the strength of the criticisms which have been made on the Gospel accounts of these supreme miracles.

Speaking in the person of a supposititious "John Pickard Owen" he announces that he will prove so clearly that Christ rose, that a jury of educated men would consent to it, on the strength of the evidence, even if they had never before heard of Christianity—and, then, of course, he does nothing of the kind.

For Butler there seemed only two possible solutions of the difficulty, if he was to be able to give grounds for his disbelief. One was that Christ actually died on the cross and was buried, and that the appearances of Him recorded later, and the firm belief in them of thousands of honest men were due to collective hallucination. The other alternative was, that Christ did not die on the Cross, but only fainted, being resuscitated later, and eventually conveyed out of Judea by the wealthy Joseph of Arimathea.

Even Butler could not swallow the first of these solutions; and he devotes a substantial part of his book to settling Strauss and the hallucination theory: and does it so well and so thoroughly, and with such urbanity, that it makes the feebleness of his treatment of the second theory all the more conspicuous. Butler had decided that a belief in the Resurrection was a logical impossibility

for a man who had parted company with the Unseen *in toto*, and in order to achieve a *locus standi* he found that he had to accept *some* difficulties—so he decided to consider it quite possible:

(a) that the Roman executioners didn't know their business, and the soldiery on guard were slovenly or venal, or both;

(b) that the disciples were all ignorant that Christ had been taken down from the Cross alive;

(c) that a person of the character of Joseph of Arimathea would consent to a contemptible deception; and, finally,

(d) that Jesus Himself would submit to being an agent of this deception, and would further allow Himself to be smuggled away, and absolutely cease to preach, teach or proclaim His mission for fear of again coming into conflict with the authorities.

That a man of Butler's critical capacity could, after several years' study of the New Testament, arrive at such a preposterous conception of the character of Christ, shews to what an alarming extent dispensing with the spiritual side of one's nature dwarfs the understanding.

Butler in the course of his dialectic gives Paley and Dean Alford some very hard knocks, and well-earned ones; but his very recognition of the absurdities in other people's arguments makes it all the more astonishing that he was so totally blind to the absurdities in his own; for there is no doubt whatever that he was absolutely honest.

The Memoir of the pretended author by his equally imaginary brother which prefaces the book is a delicious piece of satirical character-presentation, and yet it is studded with stirring passages which shew how strongly the preaching vein still persisted in Butler's nature. For instance:—

"There is no such enemy to mankind as moral cowardice. A downright vulgar self-interested and unblushing liar is a higher being than the moral cur whose likes and dislikes are at the beck and call of bullies that stand between him and his own soul."

"We have cut down Christianity so as to make it appear to sanction our own conventions; but we have not altered our conventions so as to bring them into harmony with Christianity. We do not 'give to him that asketh,' we take good care to avoid him."

"Why say that it is Christianity which is our chief guide, when the words of Christ point in such a very different direction from that which we have seen fit to take. Perhaps it is in order to compensate for our laxity of interpretation upon these points that we are so rigid in stickling for accuracy upon those which make no demand upon our comfort or convenience."—

and similar words are such as might come with advantage from any pulpit in any church to-day.

Moreover, with that curious knack of stumbling upon lines of thought, the general acceptation of which was then many years in the future, (so characteristic of his satire and to which George Bernard Shaw refers as Butler's "extraordinarily fresh, free and future-piercing suggestions") when he is intending to burlesque the would-be harmonizers of the Gospel narratives he speaks of the personality of Christ as it has come down to us through the ages as not a precise and stereotyped picture but as "the highest ideal of which each Christian soul was capable"; and further asks (still in burlesque) whether four faulty sketches, each taken from a different angle, are not more likely to give us a true idea of the reality of a person's character, than a single photograph.

That Butler should be able to throw out such a suggestion as this quite casually, without in the least seeing that it cuts the ground entirely from under his own feet when criticizing the inconsistencies of the Synoptists, is another instance of that surprising blindness in one eye to which I have already alluded.

In *Erewhon*, under the figure of describing a curious and secluded community stumbled on by a certain Higgs in the Alps of New Zealand, Butler satirizes most happily the inconsistencies, the fads, the conventional shams of mid-Victorian English life and habit, many of which are so powerful among us even to-day.

It is a great temptation to linger over the irresistible topsy-turvy humour and the solemn flippancies by which he makes us laugh—or at any rate grin—at the folly of the things which we all continually take for granted as he describes the various developments which have taken place amongst the Erewhonians in the centuries since they broke off communication with the rest of the human race; but I must content myself with advising those who are satisfied with the wisdom of our methods of dealing with crime, with children, or with education—to name the first matters which come to mind—to read *Erewhon* carefully some half-dozen times, at intervals of (say) a couple of months. The importance of the book to our present enquiry, however, is that it reveals how thoroughly saturated Butler's mind was in the questions of religious observance and theological dogma. Of course everyone who has read *Erewhon* with any intelligence realizes that in the chapter on "The Musical Banks," those beautiful and ancient stone buildings to which all respectable Erewhonians go on certain days of the week to purchase some peculiar imitation coins to carry about with them—not because they would buy anything, but because it was considered the thing to do—Butler is hitting at the Established Church in England, and the spirit that makes church-going merely a mark of social respectability. But, as a matter of fact, there is hardly a subject touched on in the book which does not refer back in some way to either religious dogma or religious practice.

In "Birth Formulae," for instance, under guise of describing the Erewhonian habit of treating the birth of a child as an unjustifiable intrusion into a peaceable human family by an inhabitant of another world, and the written promises of good behaviour and reparation which the newcomer is required to sign (by proxy), he tilts at his original hobgoblin, infant baptism, and at confirmation; in "The World of the Unborn," in giving the Erewhonian ideas as to pre-existence and under what condition the

unborn spirits make their way into human life, he derides the conventional ideas of heaven and the future life; in "The Colleges of Unreason," he is aiming at the education given at Oxford and Cambridge under the aegis of the Anglican Church; in "Ydgrun and the Ydgrunites," in the midst of an ironic lashing of England's fetich-worship of all that is respectable and successful, he steps aside to cast a stone at the whole theory of personal immortality and of future reward or punishment; while the whole tone of the narrator's comment throughout the book is (intentionally) that of a narrow literal-minded person of strict evangelical piety, even to the point of seeing in the Erewhonians the lost Ten Tribes of Israel, and of proposing at the end of the book, after his escape from the country, to return with a gunboat and convert them, by deporting them forcibly to work on the Australian sugar-plantations, where they will have splendid opportunities of becoming acquainted with the Gospel.

Now Butler supposed himself to have given up all belief in Christianity by 1863, and during the following years he had flung himself into art as a profession and was making desperate efforts to earn his living by painting. Yet, as he himself says, he did not write these books (nearly ten years later) because he wanted to, but because they came and bothered him and insisted on being written. This shews that subconsciously he was still very much concerned with Christianity; for a man can scarcely have a running sore on his leg after his leg has been amputated. *The Fair Haven* and *Erewhon* thus take on somewhat the air of a formal *Apologia* made to appease the accusing spirit of his own subconsciousness.

He does seem to have satisfied himself for the time by writing them; for he was able to cast about and find a substitute for the God of the Christian revelation in the God of evolution.

His interest in Darwin and, as he called it later, "Charles-Darwinism" (as opposed to "Erasmus-Darwin-

ism") dated, as I have already mentioned, from the days of the publication of *The Origin of Species*, and as he grew more enthusiastic over it the Darwinian theory of evolution obviously seemed to him a justification for his way of treating his possible religious difficulties.

After he had eased his mind with *Erewhon* and *The Fair Haven* he turned seriously to evolution for a solution of his persistent theological instinct; and very soon his eye, so critical of others' mistakes, discovered the weak spot in Charles Darwin's theory—the supposed absence of purpose in variation.

His own thinking and reading on the subject soon brought him to a realization, not only of the theological aspect of evolution, but also of the identity of the organism with its progenitors.

He quarrelled with Darwin, not only on the score of his supposedly erroneous science, but on the question of common honesty; for Butler claimed that Darwin was not, and knew that he was not, the author of the idea of natural selection, and, moreover, that he had allowed or contrived the falsification of a translation from the German for the purpose of injuring Butler's scientific reputation.

Butler's three principal books on Evolution—*Life and Habit, Evolution Old and New* and *Unconscious Memory* appeared between 1877 and 1880; and as if to emphasize the theological nature of his interest in the subject, in 1879 a series of articles by him appeared in *The Examiner* which, some years after his death, were published as a separate volume under the title *God the Known and God the Unknown.*

This curious little book illuminates the other three most surprisingly. It shews exactly why Butler was so fiercely incensed against Darwin,—so much so, indeed, that he dropped the rapier of irony which he knew how to use so well, and endeavoured to damage his opponent with the clumsier club of abuse. To him, now, Darwin

was a false prophet. Evolution was in Butler's eyes a description of God—and towards one who gave a wrong account of it he felt the old fashioned *odium theologicum* under a new guise, and the obligation to denounce him, as all theologians, of whatever creed, have from time immemorial denounced their opponents.

In *God the Known and God the Unknown* Butler definitely sets out to tell us what God is; and although he begins in a spirit of apparent humility, and with a confession of ignorance, saying—

"As to what God is, beyond the fact that He is the Spirit and the Life which creates, governs, and upholds all living things, I can say nothing,"—

on the very next page but one he announces:

"I will indicate the Living and Personal God about whose existence and about many of whose attributes there is no room for question; I will show that man has been so far made in the likeness of this Person or God, that He possesses all its essential characteristics, and that it is this God who has called man and all other living forms, whether animals or plants, into existence, so that our bodies are the temples of His spirit; that it is this which sustains them in their life and growth, who is one with them living, moving, and having His being in them; in whom also they live and move, they in Him and He in them; eternal in time past, for so much time at least that our minds can come no nearer to eternity than this; eternal for the future as long as the universe shall exist; ever changing, yet the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. And I will show this with so little ambiguity that it shall be perceived not as a phantom or hallucination, but with the same ease, comfort, and palpable flesh-and-blood clearness with which we see those near to us; whom, though we see them at the best as through a glass darkly, we still see face to face, even as we are ourselves seen."

"I will also show in what way this Being exercises a moral government over the world, and rewards and punishes us according to His own laws."

Not a particularly modest programme, it will be observed, for an investigator who is to start absolutely from first principles, *tabula rasa* as it were, putting aside everything that has been written, thought or spoken previously on the subject of God.

As in the case of *The Fair Haven* he begins by attacking an opposition theory and demolishing it neatly and with

despatch—in this instance, Pantheism; and, by way of still further clearing the ground, he attacks the clause in the Athanasian Creed defining the personality of Christ, a proceeding which ought not, from his point of view—seeing that theoretically he had long ago disposed of the entire Christian religion—to have been necessary.

Then laying down the astonishing axiom:

". . . . there can be no God who is not personal and material: and if personal, then, though inconceivably vast in comparison with man, still limited in space and time, and capable of making mistakes concerning His own interests, though as a general rule right in His estimates concerning them,"

he finds that as the personality of a man is composed of a multitude of separate cells, all ignorant of the nature of the man which they make up, so God is the sum total, at any one moment, of all living things on earth, animal and vegetable, all life, in its descent from one source, strictly speaking forming a single tree, and being the Spirit of God,—or to put it in the words of his own summing up:

". . . . the Tree of Life lives and thrives as a single person, no matter how many new features it has acquired during its development, nor, again, how many of its individual leaves fall yellow to the ground daily. The spirit or soul of this person is the Spirit of God, and its body—for we know of no soul or spirit without a body, nor of any living body without a spirit or soul, and if there is a God at all there must be a body of God—is the many membered outgrowth of protoplasm, the *ensemble* of animal and vegetable life."

This God, the God of the Earth, he calls "God the Known." "God the Unknown" is the immeasurably vaster God made up in the same way of all the multitude of Gods in the universe.

The sweet simplicity of this scheme of creation will strike any one; and clearly the mind which framed it could not have been a subtle one. If it had ever occurred to Butler to criticize consciously his own work, it might have flashed across him that a God who was the sum total of all living things on earth would average up as a Being considerably less intelligent, less moral, even less sentient, than an Australian bushman.

Moreover, as did occur to him later, he had no shadow of right to separate the organic from the inorganic, and leave the mineral matter of the earth out in the cold and unaccounted for.

So after all, Butler's self-made theology did not satisfy even himself.

After his tilt with Darwin, for the next twenty years his life was devoted to a variety of interests in music, art and general literature; yet through them all the theological bias can be traced. In music, his worship of Händel, to the exclusion of practically all other composers, is sufficient evidence of his tendencies. In art, his best and only useful work was in connection with the religious paintings in certain obscure Italian churches; and, even when upholding his famous theory that the Odyssey was the work of a woman, he compares the theology of the two works, and shews the entire difference of treatment which the gods receive in them.

Then, as his life drew to a close, the wheel turned full circle—as it so often does—and he came again to his earliest loves, Christian theology and evolution.

In 1887, he had given evidence that the latter was still in his mind, by the publication of *Luck or Cunning as the Main Means of Organic Modification;* and in 1901, the year before he died, appeared *Erewhon Revisited*, a book which is a better story, but by no means of the same value or calibre as *Erewhon* itself.

In *Erewhon Revisited* he sets out to combine his two interests, Christian theology and evolution, by tracing the genesis and rise and evolution of a supposed miracle.

Erewhon had ended by the narrator escaping from the country in a balloon, which he had secretly manufactured. On his return twenty years later in *Erewhon Revisited*, he finds that his flight through the clouds being thought miraculous, a theory that he was the child of the Sun God has sprung up, and a whole theology has been built up

upon the slender reminiscences of what he had said and done while he was among the Erewhonians.

The satire in *Erewhon Revisited* is just as keen, but it is not so kindly. There is a bitter edge to it. Butler had not been accorded the recognition which was his due, and he felt it.

In *Erewhon Revisited* we have the professors of religion represented as conscious hypocrites and the general people as credulous idiots or openly disbelieving, while the parody of the Anglican service and of the words of Christ is not altogether in the best taste.

But as Butler's last work (those posthumously published having been written earlier) it has its message, even apart from the interest attending it as the mature sequel of *Erewhon*.

It shews that still he was not satisfied: that his rejection of the Christian religion still required explanation; that the old man was still finding excuses for what the young man had done.

Butler was one of the most profoundly self-centred men of whom we have any record. The turning in instead of out which his boyhood troubles caused led him to make "Enquire within upon Everything" his main principle through life.

Throughout his *Note Books* as well as in all his published works we can see this persistent referring of everything to his own knowledge, his own feelings, his own wants.

He lived as a hermit, for he resented the lack of recognition which he received and would not be bothered with people whom he did not like, and was content to work for a literary immortality of which he felt secure.

Mentally he was one of the most acute, versatile and penetrating minds of his day, with an extraordinarily clear eye for folly, for pretence and for error (in others). He was utterly fearless and honest. What he believed,

that he said and wrote. What he disbelieved, that he denied, whatever weight of authority lay against him.

He went far astray, certainly, partly through a false education, partly through mental pride, but he was by instinct a theologian just as Voltaire was by instinct a sceptic, and he never really got away from Christianity to the day of his death. Not only is his life a sermon on the wrong way to seek for truth, but the Church has much to learn from him. We are all trying to carry down with us along into the future material that has been useful in the past, which is perhaps even now picturesque or sentimentally pleasing, but which is becoming more and more of a hindrance and an anachronism as we go; and Butler's irony forms a valuable touchstone of true values.

He is a profoundly stimulating writer. No Christian of any stripe can read *Erewhon*, for instance, understandingly without becoming angry, but the book stirs up the imagination and the critical faculty. It strikes through and through the comfortable *laissez faire* habit and the mental laziness which strives to base all claims on the authority of the past.

It calls on us to look our beliefs and our religious thoughts over, put them in order, and be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in us.

As Professor William Lyon Phelps, in his introduction to the American edition of Butler's novel, *The Way of All Flesh*, says, "Although I firmly believe this is a diabolical novel, I think it will prove to be of service to Christianity. I know it has done me good"—so, substituting for "diabolical," "anti-evangelical Anglican," which is apparently what Professor Phelps intends, I believe that for anyone past the flush of youth, who is tending to settle down into a mental, moral or spiritual rut, Butler's works are a priceless tonic.

We can say of him, mistaken as he was, what he himself wrote of the suppositious "John Pickard Owen" in *The Fair Haven:*

"Every fact was to him a part of nature, a thing sacred with Divine teaching of some sort, as being the expression of Divine will. It was through facts that he saw God."

Only, in the case of himself, Butler expected to be allowed to decide by his own *ipse dixi* what was fact and what was not.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

Christ the Solution of Human Life

By William Porcher DuBose, M.A., S.T.D.

There is nothing more necessary than the continual revision of ourselves and our religion, and certainly never was the need greater than at present. *Is* Christianity the solution of human life? And if so, are we Christians? In answering—or rather in proposing—these two questions, I may be pardoned, in order to get back to the root of the matter, for recalling a little of the A B C of thought and conclusion upon it.

It was Socrates who first, in our western world, brought down human speculation from the air or the clouds to fix it upon ourselves. His "Know thyself" was the beginning for us of true reflection. Plato developed the common sense intuitions of Socrates into a finished philosophy, and Aristotle formulated the whole into a science. From each of these I will select an indisputable principle which underlies all subsequent thought or conclusion. In our reflection upon and knowledge of ourself, the very first fact we encounter is that of *want*. Want is, if not

the origin, yet the inception of all life. It is the impulse not only to action but to knowledge. Feeling is before knowing; the "feeling after" what we want is the beginning of knowing as well as of acting. In the process of evolution through feeling into knowing, want becomes *wish* with the growth of consciousness, and *wish*, with the evolution of freedom, becomes *will*. Now it is with *wish* (Plato's βούλησις) in its very simplest and most elementary form—as utterance of want, and substance of will—that I wish first briefly to speak. Plato's dictum of it is, absolutely expressed: "Wish is of the good." Wish is, as a matter of fact, the most primary, universal, and necessary principle of human life. It is in itself—absolutely, as Plato says—"of the good." It is absurd to say that any man wishes, not his good, but his evil. There is of course very much of what we call "wish" of evil; but it is a perversion of the term: it is not wish but *lust* or something else. Plato, in his great idealism, or intuition of the true, the beautiful and the good, thought that all vice was ignorance, the fatal "mistake" as to the good. Aristotle saw and said that evil was not all ignorance, but much of it conscious or "knowing" choice: "Men know the better yet the worse pursue." But in substance they agreed: There is only one real want, and there is only one real wish: and that is of the good; there is only one real good.

Aristotle's great treatise—once pronounced the greatest, not only on that but on any subject, in the world—is an extended definition of the good. It is first a formal definition, which may be and is complete and conclusive; nothing else or more can be said about it. It is then a real definition, rather an exposition, of the good: which may be, or can be, final or conclusive only so far as it goes, for the good is infinite and eternal.

"The good," says Aristotle, "is that which all things aim at"—"feel after if haply they may find," "wish for"; and going farther, it is the one object of rational

knowledge, and the one end of free action. If human nature and human life be considered and described only positively and constructively, "the good" is the sole and supreme motive, process, and end of human thought, affection, will, conduct, character, life or destiny. It is in this last aspect, of human good as summing up and giving reason, meaning and end to all other earthly good, that Aristotle further defines it, and to that we will limit ourselves. All lower good, inorganic, vegetable or animal, is indeed included in and necessary to composite man—but only as means, not as end. It is only the ultimate and real human end that gives to good its meaning.

The good of any being, says Aristotle substantially, is that which completes its nature, and perfects its functions—brings all its potentialities into actuality. Thus, again, the good is identical with the end of a being. That, however, is not a complete definition: it does not cover the whole meaning of good. We may conceive of a thing and a very highly organized and complex thing coming to the end of its nature and perfected in all its functions, to which all this is not a good. There must be conscious want, intelligent or understanding wish, and rational and free will of the end to make it altogether a good. Good, to be so, must be a gratification and satisfaction of wish, as well as a fulfilling of nature and perfection of function. The element of feeling which came first must go on to the last in its successive stages and heights of pleasure, happiness, blessedness. There is no question that the final and highest expression of good is joy. No philosopher has found a further definition of the end or good of life than the identification of perfection and blessedness.

Passing on now from the formal definition to the real exposition of good, we often hear of the distinction between *personal*, in the sense of individual, and *social* good. Admitting the propriety of such a distinction, I

should not begin but end with the personal. There is no worse confusion in thought or life than the confounding the term personal with individual or particular. In fact they are at opposite extremes: the truly personal is the end and perfection of the social. No man is perfectly himself, attains full personality, elsewhere or otherwise than in the completest and truest and rightest relations with all others. The good of an individual no more exists apart from that of society, than the good of a hand or eye apart from the body, or of a branch apart from the vine. The man at last is what he has become in living with his manifold natural and spiritual relations.

Good then is a social fact: it is a matter of relation and relations. Those relations are concrete realities; they exist between actual entities, and *are* just what they are. They are succinctly expressed in our duty toward God and toward our neighbour. We will not waste our time in refuting the ancient moral heresy which would deny the primacy and divineness of the natural social instincts and affections. We are by nature children, and partakers of the nature, of a God who is Love. As God, so nature, and so *our* nature is that universal "wish of the good" for all, which is—not the impossible absurdity of an abstract impersonal love as the principle of the universe, but—the personal, living and loving God of the universe.

It is not strange that in process of evolution the universal wish of the good should have attained successively to higher—not merely heights, but even—transformations and new creations of form and meaning. The first momentous revolution or transition was the newbirth of mere natural into moral good—the passage from mere wanting, getting, and having good into doing, giving and being good. With the genesis of even the beginnings of reason and freedom there loomed into being the great fact of the moral law. The recognition of the

demand (the "categorical imperative") to do good and be good implies that of the possibility or freedom (within whatever limits) of obedience to it. And there is no possibility of a real obedience which does not carry with it and in it that of an actual disobedience. The first task of the right reason is to interpret the fact and possibility of evil—the "what" of the fact, and the "why" of the possibility. I venture to put the solution of the mystery in a single word: God wills and means—it is His "good will" or "will of the good"—to make His world a partaker of and sharer in its good. To enter ourselves into its joy—we must ourselves have been makers of its peace; and to do that, we must be full sharers with Him in its righteousness. "The Kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace, and joy": the reason and meaning and end of the world we live in is not that these three things should exist as empty abstractions or as impossible ideals. Nor is it that they should be actualized here by omnipotent fiat. God does not want the kingdom of heaven—its righteousness or peace or joy: He has it, and wants *us* to have it, and we can have it only by having them; and we can have them and it only by ourselves making them our own. The Kingdom of God is within *us*—only in *our* righteousness and peace and joy. And there is only one way of getting them.

In spite of itself the world cannot but in its heart want and wish and worship Christ. There is nothing else to worship: He is the only expression of its want, the only real object therefore of its wish;—unfortunately before the wish that is "of the good" strengthens and realizes itself in the *will* of the good, a thousand attractions, inclinations, lusts and concupiscences divert it from "the way"—from its true and real self, and it is lost. What the Way, the Truth and the Life is—we are not left in doubt. Christ stands before us first of all as the Resolver of doubt, the Winner and Revealer

of certitude, the achievement and embodiment of human knowledge of self. He reached beyond the fundamental prayer: "Noverim Te, Domine, noverim me!" He spoke not out of the wish for knowledge, but out of the knowledge attained: "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal Him." He could say thereafter: "He that believeth in me believeth not in me but in Him that sent me; and he that seeth me, seeth Him that sent me." In the clear faith of Jesus Christ the truth of God stood revealed; in the accomplished obedience of the Son, the holiness, righteousness, and eternal life of the Father were made manifest.

If God will or can reveal or manifest Himself, make Himself in any way known—where and how *must* it be? Can the heavens really declare Him? What possible image or likeness to Himself can He find in which we may see Him or know Him! There is only one that we can conceive or imagine—the knowing mind, the loving heart, the wanting, wishing, obedient will of man. There and there only can God make Himself known, or possibly *be* known, in all the range at least of our human experience. If God is good—there is nothing here that can share the goodness, nothing that can *be* good with Him, but the good will, the consentient, concurrent, cooperative *free* will of man. If God is wise—with that infinite "rightness of reason" which *knows* the good that it wishes and wills—who or what can partake of that wisdom, but the human heart that with Him loves the good and so the human mind or reason that with Him is open to know it? If God is righteous, if righteousness (along with its necessary antecedents of love and wisdom) is God,—for whom is the problem and its ultimate solution of the mighty mystery of life's warfare of good and evil? No—there is no other answer: only man can interpret God,—or God man. And the solution can be found, because it exists, only in their

unity: if we look at the actual process—in their primal unity, temporal disunion, ultimate and eternal re-union.

That neither the reason, meaning, nor end of humanity is soluble nor solvable save in terms of incarnation becomes more and more patent as we more and more take in what may be called "the other side" of incarnation. Christ has been too one-sidedly interpreted as the revelation of God: He is equally the revelation of man. We have not thought enough of Him as (1) the forethought or fore-purpose, and (2) the realization and fulfilment ultimately—of man. What humanity was to be in the end actually, it was from the beginning potentially. In every rational act or process the end is the first thing and determines all the rest; the last in execution was the first in conception; final cause was first cause. When we think of our Lord's humanity at all we think of Him too much as a man, and too little as man or humanity. He was only "once" on earth, and now He is, actually, altogether, in heaven. It is a strained figure, as we use it, to think of ourselves as His Body—or the Church as the Incarnation. For most of us all reality has evaporated out of the great fact: How much are "we in Christ"? And consequently we may well ask, How far—how deeply or widely or highly—is He in us?

What was intended for and given to man, or humanity, as the revelation or manifestation at once of God in us and us in God was given of course in the person of a man —*The* Man Christ Jesus. The universality of that Man had been historically prefigured in the assumed personality of a predecessor as universal as Himself. Permit me to give a little turn of punctuation, and so of interpretation, to an important passage (Rom. 5 : 12): "As through one man, sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned." I do not otherwise justify the change, but it brings out an unquestionable truth, an indisputable

fact: *As one man* mankind sinned and sins; in Adam all sin and all die. The "one man" expresses the solidarity of our humanity: we speak without hesitation of our all being "in Adam," and of the "Adam in us." So far from its being a strained or difficult conception, it is a natural and inevitable one: in our common nature and under our natural conditions we all sin and all die. Now there is in us not only a "temporal" but an "eternal"—an organ and function of the infinite: our "finite spirits are not products of nature but children of God." As the former (the temporal, or products of nature) we are "living souls," as the latter (children of God) we are "life giving spirit." Jesus Christ is the revelation and manifestation, as also He is the realization and fulfilment, of the eternal and the divine in us: in Him we see as clearly and definitely ourselves in God as God in ourselves. When St. Paul says, "Not I but Christ: *I* live no longer, Christ lives in me," he means that the natural and temporal self in him had given place to the spiritual and eternal. It was not the true and real "he" that still sinned and fell short of the glory alike of his primal destiny and his final realization. He had forever given up, disclaimed and repudiated the old man of sin in him, and identified himself with the new Man who, as Son of God, could not sin. Those two men are in every man, and the choice and decision between them is the matter of our probation.

That there should be the old man to be judged, overcome, and crucified in order to the attainment of the new manhood in Jesus Christ ought to be to us the most solvable and solved of mysteries. Christ presents to us the most comprehensible character and career in human history. *There* is the whole reason, meaning, and end of ourselves portrayed before our eyes. How true it is that in believing in Him we are simply believing God's Word of ourselves, in seeing Him we are seeing God in us. In deference to the principle of agnosticism

in us all, let us drop the question as to *Who*, and take it up as to *What* it was that Jesus Christ as the universally accepted embodiment (if we prefer that to Incarnation) of human faith, obedience, and self-devotion, believed in, was obedient to, and sacrificed Himself for.

First, Jesus Christ is to us the embodiment of human faith. Faith in *what*, we ask. And I answer, faith in what alone is its proper or possible substance or object: faith in reality—in the sole and universal fact and principle of existence or life as we know them. If want of the good is the one only principle and end of actuality, then good as the one fact or reality of the universe is the one substance and satisfaction of faith. If the question recurs as to the meaning and truth, or as to the indefiniteness and uncertainty, of good, I answer as before: our goods and our good are not mere ideas and abstraction, they are concrete and actual. We know sufficiently well what is the good of the body—and no less of the soul, or of the self as a whole. We know that the body and the bodily life exist as organs and instruments of the higher life and whole of the soul, and must be amenable and subordinate to its interests. We know that the highest good of the soul is its *goodness*, and that that consists in its freedom from the trammels and hindrances of sloth and sensualism and selfishness. We know that so-called individual or personal good and social good are not two but one and the same, and can only be had together. We know that the so defined right life of right persons in right relations possesses a good which in its highest expression we may call joy; that the necessary precondition of joy is peace, peace in oneself and peace with all selves; and moreover that the precondition of peace is righteousness, right thought, right feeling, and right dealing among all the sharers of the common life. Good, therefore, human good, is so far sufficiently knowable and definable to be the natural, rational, and free want,

wish, and will of all. And it *is*, at bottom, in the underlying real soul and self of every man. Yet, even so far as this, it is unquestionably hard in this world as it is—to believe in the good; so to believe in it as to live for it and die for it, to give one's life and self to it.

Yet just this our Lord did. First of all, He *believed* in it—and believed in it in spite of all His experience of all the opposite, in the wilderness, in the garden, and upon the cross. What else could have led and enabled Him to endure and survive all these? Again then, what was it that our Lord so believed in, and that His triumphant faith so manifests and reveals to us that to see and know Him is to know *It?* It was, behind and before all the poverty and sorrow and want—the deep-down divine *wish*—of the world, the infinite and eternal will of the good as the principle, potency and promise of its ultimate destination. That mind and will and purpose of the good so underlies and indwells all being and all life, that we must perforce conceive it as before them, principle, final and first cause of them: in other words as the reason, meaning, end and purpose of the universe as we know it. Whether such a first principle and cause could have pre-existed abstractly and unconsciously, itself without all by which it was to manifest and reveal itself in its own creation or evolution, we need not pause to consider. However properly agnostic we are or ought to be, we are not assuming too much or venturing too far in knowing and addressing it in terms of ourselves, attributing to it the reason and the freedom which from it we have ourselves received.

At any rate our Lord, speaking out of "what (in the perfection of the faith of which He was Author and Finisher) Himself saw and knew," speaks of and speaks from the manifest principle of this world as it is, not as abstract reason, meaning, promise, or potentiality; but as His and our Father, whose children we are, bearing His image and called to share the glory of His likeness.

But the faith of Jesus was only the beginning of His self-revelation. He embodies to us something yet more difficult or in itself impossible than human faith, that is, human *obedience*. Obedience must not only know its truth, but live its knowledge: "If ye know those things, blessed are ye if ye do them." There is no doubt, in the mind not only of the Church, but of the world, that Jesus lived His faith, *was* what He believed. There may be some question as to how, or in what sense, He realized His faith in Himself, but as to the utter and complete faithfulness as well as faith of Jesus Christ there is practically no question. His baptism of profession, in water, went on unhesitatingly to the baptism of performance, in blood. Human life in its totality must be not only profession but performance, not only faith but obedience, not only the water of repentance, but the blood of death and resurrection.

Why should human faith and human obedience, human life, be so hard, so painful and humiliating, so impossible for flesh and blood? If we really knew and really lived our Christianity, we would ask no such question; we should know for ourselves that it could not and ought not to be otherwise. Take the utmost limit of all that our Lord underwent;—how else could we express or measure the perfection of His faith or of His obedience? Why?—Because not otherwise could there have *been*—could there have originated, or developed, or been attained—such a human faith or obedience. In other words, not otherwise could our humanity have achieved such a reason and freedom and personality of its own—have so transcended itself as to realize the height of selfless selfhood that makes it like unto God. "Perfected through suffering" —"made perfect by the things He suffered!" And when at last our Lord prays to be glorified with the Father in heaven as He had Himself glorified the Father upon earth, —what was the glory He sought, as had been that He had

achieved? It was the one and only possible glorification of our humanity—the finding of faith, the doing of obedience or righteousness, in, through, and by just such conditions as environ us—all their hardness, all their painfulness, all their hopelessness, all their impossibility. It is a high glory that God calls us to, "to be perfect even as He Himself is perfect," to be righteous with a righteousness not lower or less than His own. If we want to be sons of God, bearing God's nature and doing God's work, we must not stop at impossibilities, we must not stagger under a faith that can remove mountains, nor faint in an obedience that can not only believe all things, but do all things, bear all things, and *be* all things.

Faith and obedience do not complete the manifestation of our Lord's glory in our humanity. There is another element necessary to their completion, as indeed to their existence. We said somewhere above, in speaking of the successive, not merely stages, but revolutions and transformations in the very meaning of good, that the first of these was when natural good passed over into moral good: when in the appearance of reason and freedom good became *our* good, and we rose from mere objects or receivers into doers and subjects of good. When the Law came in, righteousness came with it in the form of the demand upon *us* for righteousness. Righteousness is *our* doing good and being good: good passes from all lower senses into the higher sense of the "good will." There is nothing good now in the full meaning of the term but the good will: men are become as God knowing good and evil. But the high call to conformity to the good will, the glory of a righteousness like unto God's, the privilege of sharing the holiness and attaining the perfection of our Father in heaven,—in a word, the Law (for that is what the Law means and requires of us as the ultimate condition of human life: "Do this, be this, and

ye shall live")—the Law, I say, how could it end, how did it end, but in the demonstration of its impossibility! The Law could only bring us so near to righteousness as to give us the experience of unrighteousness, prepare us to know obedience by awakening us to the sense and fact of disobedience. "By the Law was and is (only) the knowledge of sin." For that purpose only was "the Law given, that sin might abound and become exceeding sinful"—make itself felt in all its evil, that man might know the want, the need, the necessity of holiness in all its good.

And so comes in the paradox of the next and final transformation or transcendence of good: Good must be *our* good or goodness, the good will *our* wills, righteousness *our* right thinking and feeling and acting and essential *being*. That is the Law, and the Law cannot be annulled, for the Law is the life: it is simply the expression, definition, declaration of what life is and how it must be lived. What then, if the Law is impossible, and if its claims and requirements, instead of producing holiness, only convict and convince of sin, instead of giving life only inflict death? The answer to this is in what I have called the paradox: Righteousness must be *ours*, and *not ours*, life must be "ours" and "not ours." "Not ours" because a higher and larger than ours—a higher and larger which includes not only ours but all others', of which ours is only receptive and participant and co-operant. And yet necessarily "ours" too, because unless "ours" is of the all, and the all is ours, by our own consenting and co-operating act, it is impossible and non-existent. My righteousness and my life—in the sense in which I shall further expound them—will not be equally, but will equally *be*, both God's and mine in order to be mine at all. "Our wills are ours, we know not how,"—but they *are* ours, and we must take them so and make them so, if anything soever is to be "ours" in the true sense. For not only

"what a man thinks in his heart," but even more what he wills in his life—that, and that alone, is *he:* righteousness and life are ours if we will, and only if we will. We may not know the *how* our wills are ours, but we have no excuse for not knowing the *why:* "Our wills are ours, we know not how,—our wills are ours to make them Thine." We are free—that we may of ourselves take part in and make our own the good will that is the reason and meaning and end of our universe. The righteousness which is the precondition of the peace and joy that are the kingdom of God, for the coming of which we pray—itself has its precondition.

Righteousness is indeed a necessity to any and all goods of life—to any kind of peace or joy in it, to any satisfaction or even endurance of it. But no selfish necessity, no earthly prudence or wisdom, no merely rational law or compulsory legislation or moral sanction or consent will ever beget or create the righteousness we want. Even the deepest thinkers have sought something before it, behind it, and within it to give it worth enough, life enough, and power enough to conquer all obstacles and survive all trials. If the actual righteousness of the world is needed for conquest of the world, reversely it needed all that resistance and opposition of the world for its own perfection through conquest of it. The world of sin and death and hell was necessary to the making of the righteousness which abolishes them all. So Aristotle sought a *prius,* an antecedent ground and root and principle of righteousness in *philia.* More recently some have sought it in *endokia,* a natural good will antedating, pervading, and preserving all existence as source and condition of it. So naturally are we assured of and accustomed to the *fact* that all things in their essential being and function are aiming at and seeking the good, that philosophy, science, and empirical ethics simply start at that point, without questioning the why or how.

Religion alone raises, or at any rate answers that question. The *prius* of so-called natural, abstract, ideal *philia* or *endokia* or what not, necessary to account for it (it says) could never have originated, and become efficient and actual of *itself:* the mere abstract cannot concrete itself or the impersonal become or make the personal. It must have existed as pre-creative reality and efficiency, as eternal personal divine Wish and Will ("good pleasure" in Scriptural phrase)—in order so to have become and to be the universal actual principle of all creation. We cannot worship the patently necessary *prius* (not temporal but logical), the precondition and cause of a universe whose manifest reason and meaning and end is universal, rational, free, and personal righteousness, peace, and joy—as abstract potentiality or immanent necessity. We can but worship the *Who of it* as God, and the What of it as Love,—because that is what it is—whatever more it be. Whatever of actual agnosticism or boundless ignorance the words or terms in and by their limitation may to higher or further intelligence express, we know they are true so far as our knowledge goes.

So to return at length to our third element of our Lord's manifestation of the divinely human life,—faith and obedience complete, realize, and fulfil, become *all* themselves only in and through the essential culmination of sacrifice. Even from our inchoate point of view there is no possibility of denying this as the culminating principle and fact of creation, of nature, as finally evinced in human life. The principle of sacrifice, as that of good, has been subject to the process of evolution: it has had to make itself, rising from the purely natural and unconscious into the conscious and moral, from the involuntary into the voluntary, from the necessary into the rational and free, from the impersonal into the personal. I need not say how far sacrifice is still from having become the law of human

life, the discovered and applied essence and principle of human righteousness, peace, and blessedness; but at least we have got as far on the way as the following: There is in the long run nothing human so recognized, so convincing, and so worshipped as genuine and real *heroism*. And we have come practically to admit that where the element of sacrifice is not merely lacking, but is not the gist and essence and matter of an act or a character, there is no real heroism. Already the meek are beginning to possess the earth, and they are destined to do so completely under "the Name that is above every name"—the name of humanity's Lord. What as yet stands in the way of His more universal kingdom is our lowering, if not perversion and degradation, of the truth and meaning of *meekness*. We do not see that it is, in the person of our Lord, the supreme and absolute human heroism: man's complete victory over *self*, as the last and greatest and most obstinate of obstacles not only to God's kingdom and righteousness, but to man's own greatness and blessedness and self-realization. He that gives himself gets himself, he that loses finds himself, he that serves God and man, in the act of self-transcendence attains self-fulfilment.

Taking the Cross of Christ as the necessary culmination and limit of His human faith and obedience,—among the thousand points of view from which it may be seen and described, I select the following: There is a point in the human approach to God, or at-one-ment with God, at which we say (in scientific theology) that "formal freedom" passes, is transformed, into "real freedom." Men can sin; if they could not, they could not be holy, for holiness is the free and *voluntary* not-sinning, it is *choice* between holiness and sin. In the process of sanctification, of becoming holy as God is holy, there is (so to speak) a moment, a crisis, in which one "dies to sin," surrenders all sinning to the limit of the loss of the *posse peccare*, the power of sinning. That

is the transmutation of formal freedom, the *posse peccare*, into real freedom, the *non posse peccare*. Real freedom is eternal life, it is the highest heaven. When our Lord's faith and obedience approached its final and completive act upon the Cross, He spoke of it as the "crisis" of this world—the end of sin and death and hell in humanity as represented in His person—in humanity at large so far as it should be ultimately included in His person. Then was the beginning of the new creation, the restitution: the conquest of sin, casting out of Satan, and abolition of death.

The so-called "work" of Christ, of which so much is made, of which too much cannot be made, cannot be interpreted apart from Himself. It can be seen of course only in what He did; but what He did is visible only in what He was. He brought humanity in faith, obedience, and sacrifice up to God and into God, by the surmounting, overcoming and abolishing in these all that stood between and separated humanity and God. In Christ, the individual spiritual Man, we see the natural limitations, hindrances, and impasses of our humanity all transcended. These may be reduced in principle to three, sloth, sense, and self—the fundamental obstacles divinely and designedly put in our way, that in and by overcoming them we may evolve, find, and fulfil ourselves. The first obstacle, as the natural principle of *inertia*, is as essential in the moral and spiritual world as it is in the physical. The primary virtue of effort, exertion, energy could not come into being except over against and in overcoming the hard, the painful, the impossible and yet necessary and obligatory, in human action, activity, and actuality. Life is not static or passive, it is active—in all that is positive, real, and constitutive in it: all that is *actual* in it is act, action, activity. To complain that life is hard in any sense, kind, or degree of hardness, is to complain that life is *life*. To say that effort or energy is for the most part natural or con-

stitutional and not acquired or therefore a virtue, may be true of some lower forms of energy. But the higher or real energies of real life do not come that way. The energy of a faith, or an obedience, or a self-sacrifice like Christ's is a height, an extreme, a limit of human actualization and personal achievement and attainment that nothing else in the world but itself could or can be.

The second natural obstacle to oneness with God is sense or sensualism. If we were meant and called to be spiritual beings, why were we made first to be beings of flesh and blood, with bodies, parts and passions, with the powerful incentives to the things and interests and pleasures of this life? To beings predestined not merely to action but to freedom of action, *choice* was as necessary as effort and energy, and even more vital. As a matter of fact energy is only a formal not a real virtue. It is as necessary in a bad action as in a good action, in a devil as in God: it has nothing to do with the moral or spiritual *quality* of the act, but only with its efficiency. The function of choice is to discriminate qualitatively among acts, to distinguish good and evil, to approve the things that are excellent. The true exercise, trial, and test of choice is not bluntly between good and bad: no one will wish or choose the bad simply as bad. Wish of the good, as we have seen, is the universal instinct, impulse and aim of all things, as well as the right reason and true freedom of those most highly endowed. Choice is rather between or among goods than between good as such and evil as such. We learn in lower goods how to compare, contrast, and value them, how to elect among them, to prefer the better and ourselves to arise to the higher. The quality and worth of ourselves depend upon and are determined by these insights, judgments, decisions, choices. The end divinely in sight for us is the cultivation and attainment of the right reason or judgment, to know and value

goods according to their worth, and the freedom in pursuit, acquisition, or accomplishment of them. The man who loves eating and drinking, or money-making, or empty pride or ostentation or applause, more than righteousness and peace and joy in the holiness of God—is not consciously choosing between a good and an evil as such; he is choosing between vastly discrepant but not in all cases or necessarily contradictory goods, and making a very foolish as well as fatal choice. It is the folly that is the essence of the sin: a man's true value and worth, his choice, pursuit, and attainment of the highest and the best, is an obligation, a debt, a duty, which he owes to himself, to others, and to God. It is an obligation which carries its own sanction, its own reward or punishment, its own heaven or hell with it. God does not have to work these things, He has so ordained and made them that they work themselves. "Do these things and ye shall live; do them not and ye shall die": the so living or so dying are not mere matters or incidents of fact; they carry in them and with them all the accompaniments of glory or shame, of joy or pain, of height or depth, that human experience has invested them with. The natural life then of sense—or of sensationalism, from its lowest form of appetite to the highest of empirical reason and natural understanding—is not an evil to be renounced; it is a stage or a plane to be transcended, to be passed through and above, and to be used to the uttermost as the necessary stepping stone to higher things. St. Paul (Rom. 6) represents the bodies, parts, and passions which we make the instruments of our sins as being so far from sinful in themselves as equally to be the necessary instruments and conditions of our human holiness, righteousness and life. The essence of sin is the using the lower *for* the lower, instead of for the higher and the highest, not using it as a stepping stone to the higher things. I like to think of our

Lord as having passed *through all the heavens* into the very Heaven of heavens.

It is instructive to remember that, in the general tenor of our Scriptures, there is a sin beyond and above those of sloth and sense. When inertia (the root of the negative in us, the voice of simply not-being, the bottomless sin of omission) has been overcome by energy, of which it was the occasion and counter-cause; when sense or sensualism has given place and given rise to spirit and spirituality, which comes in and through and by its—not so much conquest and effacement—as by its conversion and sanctification; there still survives an obstacle and enemy which may be found even in the energetic and the spiritual, or in the most energetically spiritual and spiritually energetic. What do we mean by "spiritual pride"? Do we not read of a revolt or rebellion in heaven itself—among angels who are not creatures of sense, and certainly are not devoid of energy? In our Lord's typical temptations, after He had repelled and disposed of all assaults or attempts upon His faith or His faithfulness, there came the farther, subtler, more intimate and personal temptation—of setting up Himself in setting up His kingdom. Our Lord knew instantly that the most secret remembrance or thought or seeking or conscious presence and part of self in the supreme conception of His Kingdom was treason to the Divine, was a worship of Satan instead of God: "Get thee behind me, Satan!" The last touch, the touch of perfection, to be put to the kingdom of Christ is this: "And when all things shall have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son Himself also be subjected unto Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all." The all-in-all-ness of God is the end of religion: when Christ died upon the Cross the human self of possible sin, because of possible separation or otherness from God, died with Him. That death is the goal of us all: "In that He died He died unto sin, in that He liveth He liveth

unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin and alive unto God!"

How can we so reckon ourselves? Our Lord tells us *how* He Himself is the way: "He that believeth in me, believeth not in me but in Him that sent me, and he that seeth me seeth Him that sent me." We persist in, we insist upon, seeing in Him not the one Man Jesus, but God Incarnate, God in our common humanity; the glory of our manhood, not only as it was with God before the world was, in conception and predestination, but as it is with Him now in consummation and fulfilment.

But Christ is not only the first and the last, the divine end in purpose and fulfilment, the final cause of creation. He is the revelation to us not so much of these as of the divine process between these. If we were son of God in the beginning, in potence and promise, by natural creation, the question remained, how we were to be so in the end, in act and fact, or in realization and fulfilment. Between these two extremes emerges and is to be determined the whole question of the *we* and of our part in the process, and our minds and our wills in the matter. God will make us, will we make ourselves?—Both the makings are essential to the making;—and we shall be made only when the two wills are *one*. Whose will shall it be? God's, of course, we say; but then,—God's will in the matter will not *be*, unless *we* make it ours.

In the light of the human faith, obedience, and sacrifice of Christ, I can see every question of religion answered, every phrase or term of Christianity explained. Such ideas or expressions as incarnation, salvation, redemption, completion so patently interpret themselves that we need not further consider them. Atonement in its original and proper sense of at-one-ment, of reconciliation, the making peace between God and man—is sufficiently plain. So too with the word propitiation, in its simpler sense of bringing near or conciliating. But

there is no question that in such words as atonement, propitiation, satisfaction, Christianity has intensified the meaning and emphasized an element that must be reckoned with. Certainly no human being has of himself or in himself *satisfied* even himself—the law of his own being, of his own perfection and blessedness. That man is a finite being under an infinite law, no man who lives and thinks can question. That perfection, as not an individual but a social act and fact, is a debt, a duty, an obligation—to oneself, to society, to the world, and (in all these and above them) to God—is indeed a "categorical imperative," the ultimate test and standard of moral, spiritual and personal worth. Now it is not that God sovereignly and autocratically imposes upon and exacts of man categorical obedience to that absolute law, or conformity to that perfect standard: "Be ye perfect as I am perfect!" But it is that God has endowed us, purposed us, called or invited us to share His own perfection and blessedness. In Christ He has shown us how, has promised us that we shall, and has given us demonstration not only of His will and purpose but of His power,—if we will. "Do this and ye shall live, do it not and ye shall die"—is neither a promise nor a threat: it is simply a fact, this is life, and that is death; and only *you* will either acquire the one or inflict the other.

It is necessary for life and blessedness, it is the absolute condition of the kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy, that the law of them all shall be respected, obeyed, and satisfied. Christ has made Himself to us the Way, the Truth, and the Life of that obedience and satisfaction. He has put us in the only relation, disposition or attitude to the law and its righteousness now and here possible for us. He has given us the obedience to it not of law but of faith. To understand at once the difference and the essential relation between these two obediences is the gist and matter of the Gospel.

We cannot be saved except by obedience to the Law, and we cannot be saved by obedience to the Law—expresses the fact of the situation. To exact of us an obedience of "works" or acts, of *actual* or complete conformity, the "righteousness" which the Law expresses and requires, could have only one of several effects. Either it will be immediate condemnation and death to us: or else it will be ignored as impossible and irrelevant to us; or finally, as has been the case, we will lower it to an easily possible and average level, and render it a practicable or plausible service. The essence of real righteousness is that it must be God's or none, all or none: its only end, aim, or measure is the divine perfection. To say that this shall be the standard of all human conduct, of all personal human relation, family, community, state, nation, world,—is to say a great deal, but what less or other is there to say? Ought any man to be less than perfectly good or true or right? And supposing he were that at *any* point of less or lower, ought he not to go on to more and higher? Could he possibly attain any height at which he should not and would not feel the eternal obligation to the best, the highest, the All?

Christ shows us in Himself the necessity, the possibility, and the final realization or actuality of the perfect law of liberty or righteousness. He makes it ours, not in *fact* (that would be bringing it all the way down to ourselves, to our possible present level of achievement or attainment) but in *faith;* that makes it our infinite and eternal end and aim, our everlasting standard and measure. That is what evermore we should be bringing ourself, our family, our community, our country, our world more and more, nearer and nearer, up to. If the process were really always going on, it could never stop, inasmuch as infinity or eternity could never be reached. Faith, hope, love are principles of never ending move-

ment, action, progress. There is need for their presence and operation in the one only direction of glory to God, peace on earth, good-will in all to all, in every spot of our hearts and of the earth today.

Bishop Westcott's Teaching and the Times

By Cecil Henry Boutflower, D.D.,
Bishop in South Tokyo.

This article is written in response to an urgent request, though there are reasons that might well cause one to hesitate before making the attempt. Brooke Foss Westcott's writings, theological and social, are so full that they hardly bear supplementing from personal recollection. Unlike those of some leaders of thought they are not dependent on or greatly illustrated by his biography. Owing to his own exact use of language, there certainly never was a man whose opinions it was more difficult to represent by isolated quotations. To those who came under his influence it appears that his views are sufficiently reflected in current writings to render further articles upon them unnecessary. This appears to us to be the case either because his teaching has really affected religious thought in England more than we realize, or because (as we felt) he was "a prophet" who grasped and taught the ideas of the coming time a little in advance. But it has been urged that if there is one voice of the last twenty years which some could wish were still able to speak, when social and intellectual life are thus in the crucible on the eve of no man knows what transformation, that voice would be Bishop Westcott's: and that to collect those leading principles on which his interpretation of the warnings of the time would have been founded is a thing worth attempting for one who, though little qualified as a student of his works, had the privilege

of almost daily intercourse with him for the eleven last years of his life, and who knows how unfailingly those same principles coloured his utterance on every current topic. Such intercourse, in the case of Bishop Westcott, removed even for quite simple people the difficulty which many feel in reading his books. That difficulty comes chiefly, not from the thought, but from the almost unbrokenly abstract character of the language in which it is expressed. Colouring matter and the concrete are wanted to make it easy reading, and needed sometimes for its interpretation. In the context of current life this difficulty disappeared. On such considerations the task of the present article is urged and attempted at this time.

A new society is in the making for mankind. Not England only is "on the anvil." And surely, unless man's blindness of heart defeats God's purpose, the agony of the time is the travail of "something better." That it is to be redeemed into something more than a mere *débâcle* and throw-back of human society, that after all the pitiful waste and breakage, the shaken elements shall be readjusted to a new stage of possibilities, we are compelled to believe. But if so, the future can hardly belie the whole trend of development towards social solidarity up to the outbreak of war.

Of that belief, among theological teachers in England, Bishop Westcott was the pre-eminent exponent, as F. D. Maurice had been a generation earlier. From his first coming to his northern diocese he dwelt, even to the weariness of some of his older clergy, on the topic of "Christian Socialism" or the "Social Aspects of Christian Faith"; not because he happened to be where social and industrial questions were specially to the front, but because the "social" view of the Gospel, even for the individual, was the only one he believed in: because, as he would half seriously say, he "could never understand what 'an individual' was."

The passage from individualism to "*solidarity*" he noted as a leading characteristic of the trend of thought in his own lifetime; and as an instance of how new thought creates new language he would mention that, when in early life he employed that word, he was criticized for using a French expression. This solidarity was for him nothing less than world-wide. Often he quoted Pascal's saying, that "Humanity is a Man that lives and learns for ever." And though occupied first with promoting that spirit in the circles of national life that most immediately surrounded him, and believing intensely in the real entity of the Nation and Empire, and incidentally of the "National" Church, yet the final society for which he cared was not merely the Nation, any more than the Church of his ultimate interests was "the Church of England." But greater than the Catholic Church itself was to him "the Kingdom of God," which like other greatest things in his view was rather shadowed forth than defined. ("There is no outline in nature," he would often say.)

"For the Kingdom of God is at once spiritual and historical: eternal and temporal: outward and inward: visible and invisible: a system and an energy. It is an order of things in which heavenly laws are recognized and obeyed. It depends both for its origin and for its support upon forces which are not of earth. It is inspired by the principles and powers of a higher sphere. It implies a harmonious relation between men and the beings of the unseen universe (*the Kingdom of Heaven*). It places its members in a social and personal relationship to a Divine Head, as citizens to a King, as children to a Father (*'the Kingdom of God,' 'the Kingdom of your Father which is in Heaven'*)." . . .[1]

"For us that Kingdom, the Kingdom of heaven, the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of the Son of man, is a present reality. We live in it, and yet we look for it. We live in it as recognizing the supremacy of a Divine law, the rule of a Divine sovereign, the constitution of a Divine Church. We look for it, as we wait for *the redemption of our own bodies.* Meanwhile we are bound by the obligations of its citizenship, heirs of its glories, sharers in its destiny." . . .[2]

"I believe that the 'Gospel of the Kingdom of God,' in its breadth and its simplicity, is able, is alone able, to interpret and to support

[1] *Social Aspects of Christianity*, p. 88.
[2] Ibid., p. 89.

every hope and every effort of men, who even from a far country are turning to their common Father."[3]

The reality and importance of these other forms of society, the Nation and the Church respectively, and their relation to the "Kingdom of God," is illustrated in the following extracts:

"The gradual recognition of the solidarity of mankind leads on to the thought of the harmonious co-operation of all its parts. International concord is the natural expression of a unity which rests upon the fullest development of all the peoples included in it. . . . A nation is strong, not by the suppression of the individuality of its citizens, but by the devotion of their various powers to a common end. So the race will attain its highest type, when the nations shall bring their characteristic forces for the service of the whole. Nations, in other words, are factors in humanity in virtue of their distinctness. There is not only a brotherhood of nations, but also, if I may use the phrase, a membership of nations, which are mutually dependent and severally contributory to a greater body. . . . We can see that the losses which we may incur through chivalrous respect for the claims of others are material, while the corresponding gains are spiritual: we can see that to mar or mutilate a great nation is to injure all nations; and that every nation as it is more completely differentiated becomes better fitted to work in union with other nations for the good of the whole race."[4]

"It may be said that this conception of a fellowship of nations in which each contributes of its wealth to all the others and receives of their fulness is a dream. I can only reply that I do not see how a Christian can rest in anything short of it. . . . Every great reform in society has been the embodiment—partial perhaps at the best and imperfect—of an ideal. The dream of one age becomes the hope of the next, and the possession of that which follows."[5]

"I ask you then to welcome as a light upon the future the thoughts of the brotherhood, the membership, of nations. . . . I ask you to remember in all the disappointments and delays which will beset your efforts for peace, that it is God's will that *the nations*—not *the nations of them that are saved* with the implied limitation of the later gloss—shall in due time, which men can shorten, *walk in the light of the Holy City*, which is the sanctuary of the presence of God, *and the kings of the earth bring their glory into it*, even the august trophies of victorious self-devotion through which the eternal powers of humanity are made known. I ask you to pray and to work, as our Church bids you, for 'unity, peace and concord among all nations' with that vision of St. John before you. I ask you to approach every problem of life, and this last problem above all, in the

[3] *Social Aspects of Christianity*, p. 96.
[4] *Lessons from Work*, p. 333 (Macmillan).
[5] *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 319.

strength of your Christian Creed, looking to the revelation of the 'Word become flesh.' . . . If you accept the call your hearts cannot fail you: your efforts cannot be fruitless. You know that it is the conflict with evil which enriches and ennobles manhood. You know that each witness for justice and humanity becomes part of the inheritance of nations and hastens the advent of peace."[6]

"It is the office of the Church, the spiritual power, to keep ever present to men, under all the changing conditions of action, the ideal which has been committed to its keeping: . . . to bear witness to the larger fellowship by which class is bound to class, and nation to nation: to maintain and to vindicate the reality of 'the powers of the age to come,' the age which, in one sense, has come. It is not its office to discuss details or to prescribe rules. These belong to men who have a practical knowledge of affairs. . . . It is, in a word, the office of the State to give effect to public opinion; it is the office of the Church to shape it. The Church educates and inspires society, which moulds the State. The State will always be a little behind public opinion, while it looks primarily to order. The Church will look primarily to progress, while it holds out in the Gospel an unattainable ideal for more and more complete embodiment."[7]

"The duty is laid upon the national Church with the obligation of unique responsibility. The national Church is the spiritual organ of the nation. It is set to welcome, to concentrate, to use every force and every grace for the good of the whole people. All that it holds is held for all. The one claim which it recognizes is need."[8]

"We must, as Churchmen, not of one class but of all classes, make our Christian Faith the rule and the inspiration of our whole life, as men and citizens, keeping steadily before us the ideal of a corporate life in Christ, wherein there can be no gain which is not a common possession, and no loss which is not a common injury."[9]

"Man is born not only for the Family, for the Nation, for the Race, but also for God. He lives in communion with the unseen as well as with the seen. The eternal, to which every outward form of social order ministers in due measure, has its own organ on earth though it is not of earth. That organ is the Church."[10]

"The Church is indeed finally the realization of the brotherhood of men, and it is the abiding pledge of that truth in the face of present separations and rivalries of nations."[11]

"The Church has been to the world in every age from the call of Abraham the herald and the witness of the revelation of a living God, of the present reality and power of the unseen and the eternal, of the intercourse of earth and heaven; . . . and for Christians the Church is the herald and witness and minister of the Incarnation, of the fulfilment of the destiny of man by the Son of God. . . .

---

[6] *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 322.
[7] *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 23.
[8] Ibid., p. 26, ff.
[9] Ibid., 37, ff.
[10] *Social Aspects of Christianity* (Macmillan), p. 67.
[11] Ibid., p. 68.

And more than this the Church is also the organ of the continuous unfolding of the treasures of spiritual wisdom, as the thoughts of men are purified and widened in the experience of life. And yet again: it is the unwearied preacher of the example, and dispenser of the gifts of Christ.[12]

With this outlook, International Peace and the problem of War could not fail to be constantly before him. "You know," he wrote once to Archbishop Benson, "I have had strange experiences of the utter neglect of this question [of Peace] by churchmen." These thoughts appear in extracts quoted above, and more explicitly in the following:

"Nations, families, men, with all their capacities and obligations and perils, belong, as such, to the ideal of humanity. Christ deals with them all, claims them all. What we see at present in societies and in men is not the Divine plan, which we could have no wish to alter, but the Divine plan marred by sin, under which we see in Christ the Divine plan, through a mirror as in a riddle. The evil nature is to be fought against in societies no less than in individuals, and in the name of God it is to be subdued. War is a necessity in nations in the same way as profligacy has been said to be a necessity for men. But all that Christ created is capable of the redemption which He wrought. Redeemed nations are necessary to a redeemed humanity."[13]

"Thus, in my opinion, our attitude towards war is surely determined. We shall accept it as a necessity, under certain conditions, in the present state of things, and when we have accepted it we shall prosecute it with unquestioning faith, as fulfilling a sacred duty. But we shall not acquiesce in the present state of things. As Christians, we shall deal with the world as it is, but, at the same time, as Christians we shall seek to purify and ennoble our social and national relations. We shall resolutely hold, to quote Is. Pennington again, that 'there is a better state which the Lord hath already brought some into, and which nations are to expect and travel towards.'"

"Meanwhile, in our labours to attain this better state, we shall remember that each nation has some ministry committed to it: that its end is not aggrandizement but service: that war is immeasurably better than the betrayal of its trust, the neglect of its duty towards those who rightly look to it for help and protection: that the use which is made of the opportunities brought by the close of a successful war is in some sense a measure of its righteousness."[14]

"Few now will deny that the nation and the race have a substantive being, no less than the family, and that it is through the

[12] *Social Aspects of Christianity* (Macmillan), p. 70.
[13] *Lessons from Work*, p. 362, ff.
[14] Ibid., p. 363, ff.

harmonious ministry of the nations that the race must reach its consummation."

"Such thoughts as these are in the air, and what has the Gospel to say to them? It is, to gather all into a word, their satisfaction. When we confess the Incarnation we place every element of humanity in connection with God. In that fact we see that every element is contributory according to its proper character to the accomplishment of the purpose of creation. . . . In the light of the Christian faith the true interests of nations are identical, because they are the interests of humanity. The loss of one nation is the loss of all; the gain of one nation is the gain of all; the disproportionate preponderance of a single power is an impoverishment of the whole body. An unrighteous victory is above all a calamity to the conquerors. If the extremity of conflict must be endured, our prayers ought to be such that our adversaries could join in them. The nations have one common life, one common end."[15]

"As Christians, then, we oppose war, not simply as wasteful of material wealth and fertile in suffering—for truth's sake we could bear greater sacrifices and greater pains—but because it hinders what has been made known to us as the Divine counsel for the progress of man both in its methods and in its results. It tends to give sanction to modes of action universally condemned in private life: it connects great virtues with unworthy or, at least, questionable motives: it is the extreme form of self-assertion maintained by force: it leaves behind a sad heritage of discontent to the vanquished and of arrogance to the victor: it separates with a legacy of bitterness those through whose generous co-operation the end of creation must be reached. . . ."[16]

"We stand on the edge of a new world, charged with new promises and new hopes."[17]

From this point of view Bishop Westcott feared the spirit of militarism, and kept an anxious eye on the Boys' Brigade movement when the discipline and drill adopted appeared to be getting too military.

But this was no merely negative attitude. He maintained that only an imperfect view of society saw in military service a discipline and a devotion greater than that rightly called for in the fulfilment of civil duties. Thus the present structure of business on the basis of competition was a form of industrial warfare for which he laboured ceaselessly to substitute the principle of co-operation. Of this he writes:

[15] *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 297, ff.
[16] Ibid., p. 299.
[17] Ibid., p. 313.

"I have dared to express great aspirations, because I believe more confidently as the years go on that men are moved by lofty motives. For me, co-operation rests upon my Faith. It is the active expression, in terms of our present English life, of my Creed."[18]

This also was one of the subjects on which, from time to time, when Parliament was not in session, he called at Auckland Castle a two days' conference of leaders of Labour and of Capital with some additional experts on the subject in hand, to consider and prepare the way to a better future.[19] The captains of industry, he maintained, should be not less capable and worthy of honour, not less truly public servants, than the captains of regimental companies. He would constantly try to analyse the reason why popular sentiment so generally exalts the soldier above the civil worker or the merchant; and, refusing the idea that the latter must needs labour selfishly, concluded that it lies in the knowledge that the former will, on due call, give his life for society. But this, he claimed, should equally be the ideal of the Christian merchant.

Of the difficulty of getting this aspect of common life realized he was fully aware, and was ever on the look-out for points of encouragement in it. Bishop Westcott had a way of fastening with enthusiasm on some minor point in a conversation which appeared to him to illustrate some big view or principle about which he was keen; and thus, at the end of a long evening spent with a missionary guest from Equatorial Africa, the thing which had most impressed him, and to which he often reverted, was the simple fact that it was a native custom on passing a man at work to call out, "Thank you, well done!" by way of salutation. This seemed to him to illustrate just that view of all true labour as a contribution to social good for which he longed. And so

[18] *Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 136.

[19] Co-operation, Profit-sharing, Old Age Pensions, Conciliation Boards, and regulation of the Brewing industry, were among these topics, if I remember aright.

C. H. B.

too he would refer to the attitude of the medical profession towards patent remedies as "that principle which it is the glory of medicine to have guarded, that any discovery by the individual is made for the service of the whole body."

It is needless to say to anyone who has read a page of Bishop Westcott's writings that the whole of this view of life and society was to him ἐν Χριστῷ,—based on a frankly dogmatic faith, and a consequence of the gospel of the Incarnation and the doctrine of membership in the Body of Christ.

"... All the religious leaders who have widely moved the hearts of men ... have prevailed by the force of definite dogmatic teaching, widely different indeed in form, yet alike directed to establish an immediate personal relation between their hearers and the triune God."[20]

"If we are Christians, our work, whatever it is, is our faith made visible. If we are Christians, we have, as we believe, light from the Incarnation upon all human problems, on the problems of business and pleasure no less than on the problems of opinion and devotion, and we must be seen to walk in the light, that our Father may be glorified."[21]

If he applied this gospel in thought and interest universally, it was not simply because the men he had to deal with were personally in fact christened men, but because in virtue of the Incarnation of Him "Who redeemed me and all mankind" he regarded all mankind as potentially within the Body. He believed in the *protevangelium* of Genesis 1:26, and in Tertullian's *anima naturaliter Christiana*, and was prepared to appeal to it. In the long hours of the anxious day when he presided at Auckland Castle over the Conference that settled the Northumberland and Durham Miners' Strike of 1892, he made but one direct reference to the Christian inspiration that moved his appeal at the climax of the discussion. "I cannot forget," he said, "that in the most solemn hour of my life, surrounded by every circumstance to render it impressive, I pledged myself to 'set

[20] *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 83.
[21] Ibid., p. 410.

forward quietness, love, and peace *among all men*':—the words are not limited for a bishop, as in the case of a priest, to 'all *Christian* people.' "

It is difficult to conjecture Bishop Westcott's attitude to the intensified nationalism which the war has naturally evoked. Desirous as he was that the entity of nations be recognized, and the distinctive characteristics of races guarded and developed, though ever for the enrichment of the human whole—no one in the sphere of missionary policy was more jealous of this than he—he would yet have had no sympathy with the spirit that in national feeling forgets the unity of the baptized in the Body of Christ. Christian prayers in war-time should, as he often reminded us during the South African campaign, be such as Christians on either side can agree in praying, after the pattern of the Lord's Prayer. And certainly he would have marvelled at the lack of conscious solidarity which (as far as we can observe) enables most of his own fellow-countrymen to dissociate themselves, on the ground of national distinction, from any sense of shame and humiliation for the outrages wrought by baptized fellow-members of Christendom, as if the tie of baptism were less than the tie of nationality! To him—as much as to any missionary living in the face of the heathen world, and more than to most such—this *débâcle* of Christendom would have been crushing; and he less than most men could have expected to see such a spectacle. The intense optimism with which he looked on human nature—which made it almost impossible to convince him on evidence when an accumulation of gross charges was proved against a criminous priest, and which once led Canon Body to say, "The Bishop doesn't understand Sin,"—would have met a terrible shock, and to the last he would have sought its explanation in false ideals rather than in an evil will.

Would this shock have changed his general attitude? There are religious minds that will henceforward be tempt-

ed to leave the world, outside the practising Church, alone to its own developments, to create for itself its own recurring cycles of hell, and roll again up hill its stone of God-neglecting civilization—minds that will repeat with new conviction St. John's complaisant words, "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the Evil one." "Let us be content," they will say, "with the apostolic outlook, and abandon this vain talk of 'Christianizing Europe' and 'leavening the world' for the more scriptural hope of adding to the Church such as shall be saved." It is unthinkable that any present experience would have dislodged Bishop Westcott from his larger hope and effort. "Prince of Bible students," as he has been called, this large view was not taken without measuring all that in the New Testament looks the other way; but it was not for him a matter of proof-texts, but implicit in the character and purposes of God and the fact of the Incarnation. Those purposes sin may delay and modify, but not defeat.

And here his faith of sacrifice would come in, as the necessary way of redemption. If the revelation of sin, effected by this war, would have shaken him, the appalling scale of suffering entailed would not have surprised or moved him, except to great hope:—not through lack of sympathy, but through his conviction of the remedial rather than merely punitive character of suffering and sacrifice,[22] which lifted him high above the poor desire to see men comfortable rather than "blessed," that degrades the humanitarian feeling of a materialist age. Sacrifice he never shrank from expecting and accepting as a condition of the well-being of the whole; and he was too convinced that there is no real good of the individual which is not also the good of the whole,

[22]N.B.—The Bishop had a special admiration for the books of Dr. R. W. Dale; but the best-known of these, that on *The Atonement*, was the one for which he cared, I believe, least; and for the reason that Dale appears to maintain the propriety of punishment in its purely retributive aspect.

and *vice versa*, to feel that the demand needed apology. When called on to take sides in the anti-vivisection controversy, the Bishop, who could never regard even fishing as a quite legitimate sport, on the ground that it sought pleasure at the expense of other creatures, would say that, so far as vivisection was necessary to medical progress, he could imagine its subjects, if gifted with knowledge and free will, saying in conformity with the law of sacrifice, "By all means let me suffer for the sake of mankind."

That the sacrifice called out by the war should, as far as individual Englishmen are concerned, be on so magnificent a scale of voluntaryism would have been to Bishop Westcott an inspiration of joy, confirming his hopes of humanity. There are some who remember how, to the surprise of many friends, he "journeyed up to the House of Lords to vote on the reactionary side" and to oppose the Employers' Liability Bill, on the conviction that it was taking lower ground, and by substituting compulsion for good will destroying all moral value in the relations of the classes concerned. Such will conjecture how reluctantly he would have seen the necessity for abandonment of the voluntary system in the Army, and how he would have hailed the unprecedented discovery of willing response. Scarcely less would have been his personal delight that the old universities and public schools of England should so lead in enthusiastic sacrifice, and the aristocracy and "privileged classes" as a whole have unforgetably justified the belief in *noblesse oblige*, and thereby for their part knit class to class anew. And on another ground he would have rejoiced particularly in the notable response of enlistment among his Durham and Northumberland miners. That, at a time when earnings for them were big beyond precedent, they should by the thousand be found willing to leave their five pounds a week and upwards for the shilling a day of the King's service, and do this for "a sentiment"

if you will, and a sentiment fired in a degree by possibly exaggerated accounts of German atrocities, but certainly for no selfish or materialist calculations—to this Bishop Westcott would have pointed as a conspicuous triumph of ideas over self-interest, of the spiritual over the material, and in it he would have found confirmation of enormous hope for men.

And if sacrifice has meant death and bereavement,—for himself he would have met it with his own intense realization of the Communion of Saints, of the oneness of life in Christ on either side of the veil, which made him remark to more than one friend, when towards the close of his life his youngest son died in India, that the real parting had come when they gave him up to go abroad, and that he seemed now given back to them through death. And certainly the Bishop would have noted with sympathy what he would have called "the revelation of life" that has been forced upon the consciousness of many in face of the holocaust of young and valuable lives which we have had to witness. When the present writer, revisiting England, asked a thoughtful friend what change in people's thinking the war was effecting, the first and ready answer was "For one thing *death will count for far less.*"

But the realization of the unseen that was his is not given to many: and for most the faith of the Communion of Saints is a poor substitute for the direct intercourse broken by death. What would Bishop Westcott have had to say to that wide-spread yearning after direct communication with the departed which such wholesale bereavement has naturally brought into notice? (It is not the object of this article to raise such questions, as if the late Bishop were an oracle whose opinion on everything was in itself worth having; its purpose is rather to illustrate how those opinions, being as they were part of one whole and coherent view of life, were formulated to take account of facts as we

find them, as well as to offer a constructive basis for the new age of society.) The nature of the answer offered to such questionings may in part be conjectured from the following:

"*To him that believeth all things are possible.* But to make this possibility a fact, we need, and we all know sadly that we need, the fresh conviction of a spiritual Presence in our troubled world, and spiritual fellowship with the unseen realized through the fulness of our humanity. Many seek it in strange, unhallowed ways, and all the while the blessing is offered to us by the Spirit sent in Christ's Name, who is disclosing to souls opened to Him fresh mysteries of the Incarnation."[23]

"The idea of a communion of saints includes two main thoughts—the thought of a life wider than the life of sense; and the thought of a life under conditions different from those of earth. The communion of saints is a communion of saints as saints, and not as men under the present conditions of humanity."

"And there is no limit to this inspiring communion. It embraces the living and the dead. It acknowledges no saddest necessity of outward separation as reaching to the region in which it is. It does not even seek for the confirmation of any visible pledge. It makes possible that unity of inward love to which final conquest is promised."[24]

"This thought of man's divine sonship in the Son of Man . . . throws light on the Communion of Saints. Whoever is in Christ is in fellowship with all who are in Him. In Him we are in fellowship with the dead in Christ. Whatever ministry we are allowed to offer to the least member of His Body in prayer or service reaches to them; and, though the veil is not lifted from the unseen world, we may believe that whatever ministry they render reaches to us also in blessing through the unity of the one life."[25]

But assuming that when the devastating cloud of this war is past, the sores of its making bound up and its own special problems met, we may still hope to see our reeling civilization go forward on an upward path, with new lessons learnt through suffering,—before we talk lightly of social construction to follow the war, there are, for Bishop Westcott's fellow-countrymen at least, grave menaces of catastrophe within home borders which the war only interrupted, but has not in itself removed. When international peace is once more declared, shall

[23] *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 121.
[24] *Church Congress Paper*, 1880.
[25] *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 34.

we be any nearer social peace? or will that day but herald a return, as some warn us, to worse and more humiliating warfare in our social life. Civil warfare over Home Rule, industrial warfare of the classes, warfare of the sexes—England was on the verge of catastrophe in all these three directions at the outbreak of war, as her enemy very well and confidently knew. It is vain to hope that the shock which subordinated them has eradicated the danger if the tone and temper of the people remains what it was, unhealed by any new constructive gospel. If individualism and self-assertion, in the name of Liberty, are still to run riot, only taking the more dangerous form of class combination: if competition instead of co-operation is still to be the accepted law of industrial life: if, by putting asunder as interchangeable and rival units what God has joined together as complementarily necessary to each other, the Woman question is to be left to settle itself by struggle without the gospel of the Body of Christ, there is no ground save a baseless optimism for hoping that it will be "all right after the war." It is not Germany only that was in danger of brushing aside everything for the appeal to force. Bishop Westcott was well aware of, and viewed with special concern the disposition, which distinguished the newer Trades-unionism from the old to accept the position of "hands" and fight it out at that, repudiating the suggestion of paternal interest and moral relation on the side of the employer. But there is no solution, he would have told us, to be looked for in the mere respecting of mutual rights. And mere Collectivism will not do; it has no gospel. Nothing less than the full Christian "Socialism" of the New Testament—recognition of the mutual dependence and service of members in the one Body—will serve for the regeneration of society.

And particularly with regard to the last controversy of the three, with his characteristic appeal to the ex-

actitude of Greek Testament particles, the Bishop would point out how, according to Gal. 3:28, in Christ Jesus there is "no Jew nor Greek: no bond nor free: no male *and* female," the very assertion of equality before God containing in its wording the implication of mutual indispensability between man and woman, along with essential distinction.

Therefore on a second occasion Bishop Westcott voted with the reactionaries: and again it was in pursuit of a higher principle. When he voted against the admission of women to university degrees at Cambridge, it was not because he did not desire the highest possible education of women, but because his "membership" conviction, with its distinction of hand and foot, eye and ear, stood in the way. Equality to him did not mean identity of qualities; and because man and woman essentially differed, the highest possible education for men could not be considered to be the highest for women. He had long ago proposed and was at any time prepared again to support efforts to obtain a first class University for Women. But to commute this for a training at a Men's University he regarded as a yielding to the second best, to be regretted in the light of the ideal. There is reason to think that the truth for which the Bishop stood, whatever may be thought of the particular application of it, will be in considerable need of voices like his to keep it in view, if in the next few years the effort to obtain for women a position fully corresponding in opportunity to that of the other sex is not to be confused with ideas of identity of endowment, contrary to fact and destructive of the perfection of both.

From out of the war-cloud itself, and from the sufficiently disquieting background on which it burst, come threats of upheaval and change enough to fill the labouring builders of constructive human progress with disappointment, the prophets of a materialistic heaven on earth with dismay, peaceable and quiet lovers of the

thing that hath been with despair, and all faithless hearts with fear. Are all these anxieties and shakings merely "sorrows" of change and loss? or are they "the beginning of birth-pangs"—the ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων of St. Matt. 24:8? From the point of view of the Kingdom of God and of Faith there can be no doubt of the answer. For believers whose God is really a tribal God, pledged to the vindication of their own particular tribe or nation, for those who have fixed their conceptions of the Divine programme, even for those who identify the Kingdom of God with the Catholic Church of history, there is room for misgivings. But for those who can read the message of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and know, in Bishop Westcott's words, that "the removal of those things that are shaken is brought about in order that those things which are not shaken may remain in serener and simpler beauty," there is more than consolation.

"We come to recognize that the difficulties which press us most sorely are really the discipline through which God is teaching us; veiled promises of coming wisdom. We learn through the living lessons of our own experience that the eternal Gospel covers the facts of life, its sorrows, its needs, its joys, its wealth. Through every conflict the Truth is seen in the majesty of its growing vigour. Shakings, shakings not of the earth only but of the heaven, will come; but what then? We know this, that all that falls is taken away, *that those things which are not shaken may remain.*"[26]

Perhaps in this sense also, though not the sense in which he primarily intended it, his words to us younger men, "the gospel for *your* age will be the Gospel of the Kingdom," have a further application.

The spirit that meets and survives such crises, and justifies itself by surviving, is the eternal spirit of faith; not faith in a particular interpretation or programme, but faith in the living God, and (for Christians) in His final Self-revelation in the Incarnation. Bishop Westcott has related how at his last interview with his former

[26] *Christus Consummator* (Macmillan).

schoolmaster, Dr. Prince Lee, they talked, old master and greater pupil, of mysteries and difficulties in the path of life. "A long silence followed. It was growing dark. He turned to me and said, 'Ah, Westcott! *μὴ φοβοῦ μόνον πίστευε.*'"[27] And if it is true that to the man whose thoughts have been here reviewed it was given to help his generation by the clearer interpretation that he was enabled to put on the phenomena of the time, it is no less true that that which inspired such vision and touched its utterance with the power of enthusiasm was that which he shared with the little children of the Kingdom, as well as with Abraham and the writer to the Hebrews, the simple spirit of unwavering faith in God.

"We need to see life as God made it, to bring to light its spiritual side, to show it in connection with the unseen. That which is poor and sordid and trivial is changed when the light of heaven falls upon it. . . . What we see is not all; what we see is not even the dim image of that which *is*. The life which we feel, the life which we share, is more than the earthly vestures through which it is at present manifested. That is not most real which can be touched and measured, but that which struggles, as it were, to find imperfect expression through the veils of sense. . . . Yes, the unseen and the eternal is for all of us who confess Christ come, Christ coming in flesh, the ruling thought of life."[28]

And so, after all, "the substance of faith," he wrote, "is not a fact which we cannot explain away, or a conclusion which we cannot escape, but the personal apprehension of a living, loving Lord."[29]

[27] *Christian Aspects of Life*, p. 194.
[28] *Christus Consummator*, p. 56, ff.
[29] *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*, p. 102.

The Churches and National Religion

By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.,
Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

Among the many problems raised by the European war not the least important is that of the place and possibilities of religion in the life of nations. In the most dreadful conflict that the world has ever seen, all the belligerents alike invoke the name of God. The cynic may well be forgiven if he contemplates such a spectacle with amused contempt, and declines to believe in the sincerity or reality of the faith thus professed. But the matter is not helped by hasty judgments of this kind. It may be true enough that the war represents a sad deterioration of our religious ideals, and has shown that many of us are still pagans at heart. But there is nothing in this to surprise those who knew anything of the real religious condition of Europe before the war. Only those who willingly live in a fool's paradise could have expected anything else. Now that the truth is out it may be possible to convince even the most complacent optimism that the religious education of these so-called Christian nations has to be done all over again. This is not to say, as some do, that Christianity has failed, or that it has done nothing to temper the brute instincts of mankind. Indeed it would be easy to make out a good case for the influence of the Christian spirit in mitigating the severities of warfare, and even in directing and subduing the minds of many of the combatants. But, admitting this to the full, it still cannot be said that the war has

anywhere called forth an exhibition of religious consciousness on a national scale.

The question at issue is not merely that of a National Church or a state establishment of religion, though to many people this would offer an obvious and easy solution. National religion is the religion of the National Church. But what if the National Church only voices the will of the State even in its most irreligious moods? What if it only represents the religion of part of the nation; what if such a thing does not exist? In theory, no doubt, a National Church is the mouthpiece of the nation's faith, but here, as in many other cases, there is a considerable difference between theory and practice. It is beginning to be recognized that the religion of a nation is best represented, not by any organization or by any external means, but by the spirit and temper of the people. In the long run religion is mainly an individual thing. It may and should find for itself corporate expression, but if this is to be adequate it must spring from the individuals of which the body is made up. The religion of any society will not be higher than that of the members composing it, though it may easily be lower, as when it becomes a matter of striking the average or finding the least common denominator. In this connection, therefore, the interpretation of religion, whether for the individual or for society, becomes a matter of paramount importance.

There is no doubt that much error and confusion in the past might have been avoided if Churches and peoples alike could always have remembered that religion is a life, and is not to be confounded with the externals in which it finds expression. Creeds, dogmas, and forms of worship, important as they are, are not of the essence of religion. But, unfortunately, when it comes to giving outward form and semblance to the faith, these things necessarily bulk largely and are apt to usurp the place of that which is far more vital. It

has to be admitted that there may be a decent external show of religion, both intellectual and devotional, without any real substance behind it, and the danger of this in all State religions is obvious and familiar. It can only be avoided by the clearest possible understanding of the fact that religion is not a matter of externals at all, but is a deep inward force depending on a relationship between the soul and a higher power or powers and issuing in social and moral activities. It is, to use a familiar phrase, more concerned with the practice of the presence of God, than with ideas about God, though no doubt the two can never be entirely distinguished. This is why freedom is of its very essence. Religion is a living thing and requires room and scope for development. It can never, therefore, be in any sense subordinate to the State or other human institution. The mere idea of State control of religion has about it a suggestion of blasphemy, when it does not indicate a complete misconception of the nature of religion itself. Ecclesiastical history gives ample proof of the mischief that can follow from wrong relations between religion and the State.

It is not yet certain, however, that the Churches have learned as they should have done from the mistakes of the past. The war has opened their eyes to a good many things, and not least to the need for a more genuine expression of religion in the body politic. It is admitted on all hands that religion, as a national force, has practically failed, and this in countries that enjoy the privilege of a National Church as well as in those that are without it. No State establishment of religion is any guarantee that the State will be guided by religion in all its actions. This having been discovered, it is no wonder that on every hand there is a demand for some readjustment of relations between religion and nationalities, and for a better understanding of their mutual spheres and obligations. Here no real help can be de-

rived from the simple formula that we must "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's"; for in our complex modern civilization the whole question turns on the difficulty of delimiting these spheres of duty. That the will of God is paramount for every religious man goes without saying, and in a clear case of conflict between the demands of the State and the law of God, he can have no hesitation as to his choice. But again the difficulty is to know just where the conflict arises. Recent events in Great Britain have shown the need there is for clear thinking and direction in regard to duty towards the State. It is not that there is any widespread lack of patriotism, but rather that long years of quiet and prosperity have made the sense of obligation to the community grow faint. Men are apt to forget that the State, like the family, is a divine institution. The war has at least done good service in arousing that instinctive loyalty which was never quite overcome, and in discovering, in dramatic fashion, unsuspected powers of self-sacrifice. But if this is to be maintained and service of the State to become once more a religious duty, the spirit which has found such fine expression under the stress of war must again become a regular and normal thing. For it is not only in war time, and at the hands of external foes, that grave and serious perils threaten the body politic. It is no new discovery that a nation's worst foes may be those of its own household, and the best test of true patriotism is to be found in the attitude of a people to the enemies within their gates. In other words there is a spiritual warfare always being waged, and the religion of a people may be judged by their willingness to engage in it, and to make all the sacrifices it requires.

Thus the function of Churches within the State is neither to rule the State nor to be ruled by it. Their place and use can best, perhaps, be described by the illustration of the parable of the leaven. They serve as

a conscience in the community, and by standing for moral and spiritual ends, and keeping alive the sense of an ideal, they best do their work. To this end they must be free and the only authority they need will be that of the Spirit of God, in whose name they act and speak. In the democracies of the future the Churches will have a great opportunity if they can use it, and may make religion quite a new thing in the life of nations. As possessing the power of moral initiative, and as standing for the higher ideals of duty and human fellowship, they should be able to intervene with an authority none can gainsay. But here again the effectiveness of the Churches will depend on the extent to which they are in the State but not of it. While they seek the good of the people as a whole, they do not interpret that good quite in the sense of the politicians, and they will always hold themselves free to be guided by spiritual rather than by material considerations. Much of their present weakness is due to the fact that they have never quite secured this freedom. They depend on money, social prestige, numbers and the like to far too great an extent. For this reason their spiritual witness is not quite disinterested or single-eyed. This is especially the case wherever the relations between the Churches and the State are such that the Churches become concerned to keep on good terms with the State, and to support rather than criticize its action. Again, it is of the very first importance that Churches should be free from all political connections whatever if they are to do their work and give their testimony without fear or favour. If the religion they represent is to be really that of the nation, it is all the more necessary that it should be wholly unofficial and spontaneous. Any Church which occupies the position of a mere chaplain to the State is likely to have its mouth pretty effectively closed.

It is difficult to predict anything with regard to the condition and work of the Churches after the war, but

it may be said with some certainty that they will be faced with a unique opportunity. Whether they rise to it will depend very largely on the extent to which they are true to themselves. One of the reasons why the religion they profess counts for so little in the national life is that they have suffered it to be regarded as only a means to an end. This has caused the Churches themselves sometimes to sink into mere social clubs or philanthropic agencies, useful enough in their way, but without any compelling voice in the national life. It is of the first importance that this misapprehension should be removed and the Churches themselves become more conscious of their unique position and vocation. They know that their authority is derived not from any human authentication, but from God Himself. They are divinely and supernaturally commissioned and endowed. In a very real sense, therefore, they are "above the battle," in the world but not of it. They deal with things only *sub specie æternitatis*, and they have a right to speak to men and nations in terms other than those of self-interest or glory. They all alike claim, as Christian societies, to be conscious of the presence of their Lord, and to act and speak in His name, and this claim must be made good if they are to be listened to.

Considerations like these, therefore, will always determine the attitude of the Churches towards national policies and interests. Their patriotism will be of a different order from that which says, "my country, right or wrong." It will be based on the belief that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people"; and to this bar they will bring all policies and diplomacies to be judged. What the prophets were to Israel of old, that the Churches should be in the public life of to-day, viz., a living conscience and a mouthpiece of the will of God. But in order to secure this, the Churches, like the prophets, must have the vision and hear

the voice of God Himself. There we touch on another of the radical defects of our present day religion, and on another cause of the weakness of the Churches, its exponents. Religion, as the Churches know it to-day, is far too subjective a thing. It rests on experience, sentiment, hearsay, rather than on some veritable, "Thus saith the Lord." It is as though God were no more than our impressions of Him—a something, not ourselves, spun out of our own vitals, making for righteousness. So religion becomes a glorified expression of human progress, and ideas like revelation, grace, and redemption, have but little part in it. But if there is one thing of which the world is becoming very certain it is that human nature is not necessarily on the up grade. We are discovering that both in the lives of individuals and of nations, there is room for cataclysmic as well as for developmental processes. If the Churches really stand for a direct descent of God into humanity, for a living revelation and for a redemptive gospel, the sooner they make the fact quite plain the better. Just in so far as they are conscious of the presence of God's Spirit in their midst, and of their title to speak in His name, will their words have that authentic note which the world is waiting to hear. No Churches can live on tradition, hearsay, or second-hand beliefs. The strange new world on which we are entering will demand reality in religion before everything else.

Here then we get some light on the place which the Churches may fill, and the work they may do in the national life of the future. They will seek always the highest good of the community at large, but they will interpret that good, not by any material or political standards, but in their own way and according to their knowledge of the will of God for men. They will be in the nation but not of it, will share its burdens but not its weaknesses, and will hold themselves free to shape its aims and policies by the light of those higher ideals for

which they stand. One of the best ways in which the Churches can make good these claims is by carrying out to its logical issues their high Christian conception of human nature. In their eyes men and women are never mere hands, chattels, cannon-fodder, means to an end, but living personalities, precious for their own sake, ends in themselves, "heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." They judge men, as Christ Himself did, by their possibilities rather than by their actual state, and they cannot allow governments, societies, or individuals to exploit human lives for their own purposes as though they were mere things. This position is fundamental and should regulate the whole action and attitude of the Churches where human beings are concerned. It was this higher valuation of humanity which led the early Church to lay stress on care for the sick and poor, which in time abolished slavery, and will one day abolish war.

No one will deny that the evangelizing of the lower races is one of the first duties of the Church, but the aim of it is not that they shall become valuable capital for the State. The Church has a concern for their souls, and even under the British flag her missionary efforts have not always been regarded with favour, just because they made for emancipation and the larger life. So at home the Churches should seek the highest welfare of all classes regardless of the effect these may have on them as political or commercial assets. Their methods, both evangelistic and educational, will aim at securing the opportunity for a richer and fuller life for all alike. The religion they profess is a charter of freedom not only for Churches and States but for individuals. Therefore, they are the sworn enemies of industrial oppression, of the exploitation of the many by the few, and of the dominance of evil things like the drink trade, and the white slave traffic. They fight them, not because they hinder efficiency and handicap the nation in the race for

wealth and power, but because they destroy the souls of men and women and mar in them the image of God. Their efforts, no doubt, serve a great national purpose and contribute to the fitness and continuance of the race, but they do so incidentally and almost unconsciously. Their methods too are their own, not those of the political agitator or the social reformer, but rather of Him who "had compassion on the multitudes" and who saw in the meanest of mankind a child of God. There is no doubt, however, that, in order to carry out these principles, the Churches need a keener conscience and a more independent witness. With the best will in the world they have not yet succeeded in influencing public opinion in the right direction. The working classes do not look to them as their natural protectors, nor have they put the fear of God into those powerful interests which batten on the folly and weakness of their fellows. It is to be hoped that in the not very distant future it may be possible for the Churches to deliver their message with such earnestness and power as really to stir the conscience of the community and prepare the way for a reconstruction of the national life and policy on a more genuinely Christian basis.

But if this is ever to be brought about it will be necessary that the Churches should be free, and that they should be united. They must be entirely independent of any form of State control, and of those interests which hinder human advancement. Even in the Established Church of England this is beginning to be understood, and it will be a great day for the religion of the nation when the Church is freed from all entangling alliance with the State. But it is even more necessary that Churches should shun attachment to political parties, and that they should avoid any cash nexus with those whose aims and policies they may have to oppose. Only as they are thus free to speak the truth in love and to proclaim the whole counsel of God, will they be able

to speak to and for the nation and to play their rightful part in its life.

But above all they must be one. There is no doubt that the feeling for unity has been greatly stimulated by the growing consciousness of the real impotence of the Churches to affect the life of the nation. It is believed, rightly or wrongly, that this is largely due to their unhappy divisions, and they would undoubtedly have more weight if they were able to take common action and to speak with one voice. At the same time it should be clearly understood that any unity brought about by the pressure of some outside need, or the desire to attain greater authority or prestige in the eyes of the world, is not likely to be very real or enduring. Considerations such as have been mentioned may be relevant enough in their place, but they are not a sufficient foundation for that unity of the Spirit at which the Churches need to aim. Such a unity will be quite compatible with much diversity of order, ideas and operations, and it will be sought for its own sake, because it is a right thing, and not because of any advantages which may accrue from it. In Churches which are really spiritual in their aim and basis, failure to love the brethren and refusal to co-operate with others who bear the name of Christ, will always be regarded as a sin. Among those who compose them there is already a oneness in Christ Jesus which only needs to be given an articulate form. Unity on a simply religious basis is quite possible, and will come about as the spiritual level in all the Churches rises. Then, and not till then, will they be able to represent the nation in its religious aspect, and to speak in its name.

The Church and the Churches

By Henry Eyster Jacobs, D.D., LL.D.,
Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

The attitude of Lutherans who have kept aloof from various efforts for Church Union should not be interpreted as in all cases one of indifference to many of the arguments that have prompted such movements. No one among her leaders and teachers who really understands the spirit of the Lutheran Church would venture to claim for her an exclusive right to existence, or to deny that denominational lines separate between those who are true children of God.

For authoritative Lutheran definitions of the Church we turn to the Lutheran Confessions. If there is one thing which those Confessions make plain, it is the assertion that properly speaking the Church is not an external institution, an outward visible corporation, but an organism spiritually united composed of all who by the work of the Holy Spirit through Word and sacraments, have become true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. "The Church properly is the congregation of saints and true believers" (Augsburg Confession, Art. VIII). "The Church is in principle a fellowship of faith and the Holy Spirit in hearts. . . . The Church Catholic is not an outward government of certain nations, but rather men scattered throughout the whole world, who agree concerning the Gospel, have the same Christ, the same Holy Ghost and the same sacraments, whether they have similar or dissimilar human traditions. . . .

What difference will there be between the people of the Law" (i. e. of the Old Testament), "and the Church, if the Church be an outward polity? But Paul distinguishes the Church from the people of the Law, in that the Church is a spiritual people, i. e., that it has been distinguished from the heathen not by civil rites, but that it is the true people of God regenerated by the Holy Ghost? . . . This Church truly exists, viz., the truly believing and righteous men scattered throughout the whole world. We are not speaking here of an imaginary" (i. e. a purely ideal) "Church, but we say and know certainly that this Church, wherein saints live, is and abides on earth; namely, that some of God's children are here and there in all the world, in various kingdoms, islands, lands and cities, from the rising of the sun to its setting, who have truly learned to know Christ and His Gospel." (Apology of the Augsburg Confession, 1531, Chap. IV.) So in the Smalcald Articles (1537): "Thank God, today a child seven years old knows what the Church is, viz., saints, believers and lambs, who hear the voice of their Shepherd." It was in the Leipsic Disputation of 1519 that Luther propounded the startling doctrine to his audience that the Church is not the hierarchy, but the communion of saints.

Nor is this definition peculiar to the Lutheran Confessions. It may be said with truth to be common to all the great Confessions of the Reformation period, and their successors. Compare with these declarations, for example, that of the Bishops' Book of the English Church of 1537, prepared largely by Cranmer: "I believe that this Holy Church is catholic, that is to say, that it cannot be coarcted or restrained within the limits or bounds of any one town, city, province, region or country, but that it is dispersed and spread universally throughout the whole world; insomuch that in what part soever of the world, be it in Africa, Asia or Europe, there may be found any number of people, of what sort, state or con-

dition they may be, which do believe in one God the Father, Creator of all things, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, His Son, and in one Holy Ghost, and do also profess and have all one hope and one charity, according as it is prescribed in Holy Scripture, and do all consent in the true interpretation of the same Scripture, and in the right use of the sacraments of Christ." So in the personal confession of the martyr, Dr. Robert Barnes, at Smithfield in 1539: "I believe that there is a holy Church, and a company of all them that do profess Christ; and that all that have suffered and confessed His Name, are saints." It is scarcely needful to refer to the fact that in Article XIX of the English Church, it is the "*coetus fidelium*"—"the congregation of faithful men"—that constitutes the Church.

So from the Reformed Confessions of the Continent we may cite the definition of the First Helvetic (1536) that the Church is "the fellowship and assembly of all saints, the Bride of Christ, which Christ cleanses with His own blood, and at last will present to His Father, without spot or wrinkle." The Second Helvetic (1551) calls it "the *coetus fidelium*"—"the congregation of faithful men called and collected out of the world, the communion of all saints, viz., of those who truly know and properly worship the true God in Christ our Saviour, and who by faith participate in all the blessings gratuitously offered through Christ." Geneva Catechism (1545): "What is the Church?" "The Body and society of the believing, whom God hath predestinated unto life eternal." Heidelberg Catechism (1563): "What dost thou believe concerning the Holy Catholic Church?" "That out of the whole human race, from the beginning to the end of the world, the Son of God, by His Spirit and Word, gathers, defends and preserves for Himself unto everlasting life, a chosen communion in the unity of the true faith." The Westminster Confession (1647): "The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists

of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof."

The attempt, however, to distinguish between an invisible Church—the assembly of true believers—and a visible Church—the assembly of those who make public profession of faith, is confusing; for the question must always recur: What is the Church in the proper sense of the term? Is the Church in the strictest sense an external organization, comprising true and false or hypocritical members? Or are these false and hypocritical people who are mingled with the assembly of believers in reality only excrescences on its body, and not really included within it? The answer to such questions is found in the Apostles' Creed, where we confess: "I *believe* that there is a Holy Catholic Church." The existence of the Church is made here a matter of faith, not of sight. They who abide not in Christ, our Master Himself has assured us, are only dead branches, and that even though temporarily on the vine, they do not belong there, and will soon perish (John 15:6). "If any man," says St. Paul, "have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9). The members of the spiritual Body of Christ, described in I Cor. 12, are those united to Him by faith. The House of God of I Pet. 2 is composed of living stones.

When, however, the Church is said to be invisible, nothing more is meant than that the precise line separating the true children of God from all others cannot be traced by man's sight; in other words, the exact boundaries of the Church cannot be located. But, on the other hand, there is a sense in which the Church is always visible. For the Church has its marks, viz.,—and on this the Lutheran and the English formularies agree —"the pure Word of God and the administration of the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance." Where these marks are found, there, according to the promise that God's Word does not return unto Him void, are

some true children of God, i. e., there is the Church. These marks are not the marks simply of what some are pleased to call "the Visible Church," but of what they designate the "Invisible." God's Word is not without God's people; nor are God's people without God's Word, since what is believed in the heart inevitably issues into confession with the lips and in the life. So far, then, as the Word and sacraments are audible and visible, is the Church audible and visible. So far as the operations of the Holy Spirit within the hearts of men cannot be traced by man's sight, but are known only to God, the Church is invisible.

In applying these tests, however, a farther caution is to be observed. While the pure preaching of the Word and the right administration of the sacraments are to be taken as evidences of the ministrations of God's Spirit and of the presence of their fruit in the hearts of men, and, therefore also of the existence of the Church, and while no diligence is to be omitted by which this Word may be preserved unimpaired, and be kept free from error either by adding to it what Holy Scripture has not authorized, or by withdrawing from it aught that Holy Scripture has taught, nevertheless as there are degrees of conformity with the scriptural standard, even beneath much error God's saving grace may triumph in men's hearts. For since God's treasure is in earthen vessels, and Christ's strength is made perfect in weakness, no limitations can be placed upon the influences of the Holy Spirit in applying the Gospel. The gradual growth of the Apostolic churches into the recognition of some of the plainest truths of the Gospel, is clearly taught in the Acts of the Apostles; and yet during all that period, even before these truths were recognized, they were true Churches of Christ. Our Lord administered a severe rebuke to His disciples, when they interfered with those who, while outside of their number, cast out devils in His name. Those who had assumed this responsibility

would themselves have to give account to Him for their procedure. Paul also rejoiced whenever Christ was preached, even although in some cases this preaching was irregular (Phil. 1:15–19).

But this in no wise justifies indifference as to the purity of the teaching. Ambassadors for Christ must keep closely to their instructions. The Gospel is a sacred trust which must be held inviolate, and is not modified according to the caprice of either the preacher or the people to and for whom he preaches. The test of the true servant of Jesus Christ is that he proclaims all the counsel of God. The ignorance and presumption of the preacher is one thing; the grace of God, which brings salvation, in spite of men's errors and sins, is quite another.

The one definite object, therefore, upon which everything depends, is the Word of God, "as the only rule and standard by which to judge all teachers and doctrines." (Formula of Concord.) It is not the Church that has made the Word; but it is the Word that has made the Church, i. e., the Word is the means through which Christ has founded and continues to maintain and build up His Church until the end of time. The Church has no other office than that of preaching and teaching the Word—for even the administration of the sacraments is included in this, since they are the seals of the Word, bringing the promise of the Gospel to men individually.

But in affirming that the right conception of the Church is that of a spiritual body of those united by their common faith, there is no denial of the fact that what is invisible has to come to light, that the universal has to be localized, and the spiritual has to be manifested under material conditions. Faith issues in confession, as the hidden stream emerges in the fountain, and the fountain supplies the stream. The heart believes; the mouth makes confession. In and through our bodies, the Word is preached and the sacraments administered. Spiritual

influences are imparted through what we see and hear. Religion is not simply an abstract communion of an individual with God, but of an individual in the fellowship of others with God. Faith not only imparts spiritual life, but establishes a communion of men with one another, which is promoted by mutual offices discharged towards one another. The common faith results in a society that assembles to hear the Word and partake of the sacraments, and to provide for the extension of Word and sacraments to others in ever widening circles, until the Lord's command to evangelize all nations is fulfilled. In the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, the pronoun is not in the first person singular, but in the first person plural. Thus the thought of isolated individualism is dispelled from every prayer of which that of our Lord is the model. Christ not only preached the Gospel, but gathered disciples around Him, with whom He lived and laboured, and upon whom and their followers He enjoined similar external fellowship, as they went forth to all parts of the world.

Hence the Church is localized in Holy Scripture, without in any way detracting from its proper conception as a purely spiritual body. The one Body comprising believers of all times and lands, becomes apparent at various places, at Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, at Philippi, at Rome, at Corinth, wherever groups of early Christians, in obedience to their Lord's directions, and impelled by the needs of their spiritual life, "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." As in our natural bodies there is, notwithstanding their many members, but one life that is found in every member of each body, so there is but one spiritual life, moved by One Spirit and found in every community wherein the common faith of the Gospel is taught and received. The only external bond of union in the primitive congregations was the common service of Apostles and Apostolic men, the common message all heard

and the common sacraments which all used. The inner bond was the union of their members with Christ, and the quickening influences of the Holy Spirit within their hearts.

As time advanced and certain practical questions rendered mutual conferences desirable, the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles show us the beginnings of some general form of external organization in the deliberations of these congregations with one another through their representatives. A sort of unwritten constitution was developed under the stimulus of missionary activity and the need of the spiritual training of congregations, composed both of converts from Judaism and of those who had been won from among the Gentiles. The details of Church government which at last became fixed cannot be regarded as belonging to the essentials of the Church. Richard Hooker, speaking for the Anglican communion, has well said in his *Ecclesiastical Polity* (Book V: VIII, 2): "The Church hath authority to establish that for an order at one time, which at another it may abolish, and in both it may do well. But that which in doctrine the Church doth now rightly deliver as truth, no man will say that it may hereafter recall. Laws touching matters of order are changeable by the power of the Church; articles concerning doctrine, not so." Precisely to the same effect, and almost in the same words, the Lutheran Formula of Concord has declared "concerning ceremonies or Church rites, which are neither commanded nor forbidden in God's Word, but have been instituted alone for the sake of propriety and good order": "We believe, teach and confess that the Church of God of every place and every time, has the power, according to its circumstances, to change such ceremonies, in such manner as may be most useful and edifying to the Church of God." It should be noted, however, that by these words, reference is made not simply to ritual observances, but also to details of organization.

It was with the greatest reluctance that the Lutheran Reformers broke with the existing form of Church government. No criticism of the Lutheran Reformation that represents it as revolutionary and an abrupt and unwarranted break with the past can be justified by a careful examination of the original sources of information. At the outstart there was no purpose to undertake any revision of doctrine, worship or polity. The entire movement arose from a protest made by Luther, in which he believed that he would be sustained by the highest authorities of the Church, concerning an abuse which had gained currency within, as he thought, a very limited territory. The movement attained a significance which he had never imagined possible, when the ecclesiastical authorities on whom he had relied to suppress it, not only defended the abuse, but also took summary measure to silence his protest and to force his recantation of the truth of God's Word that had prompted this protest. Constrained to the study of Holy Scripture, and compelled to make public defence, he was led onward to conclusions so far beyond his anticipations, that, as he looked back, he frankly acknowledged that, had he seen the end from the beginning, in his human weakness, he would scarcely have had the courage to proceed.

Even after the doctrinal principles of the new movement had been clearly taught, years elapsed before any break was made by the Reformers from the orders for government and worship under which they had been trained. A thoroughly conservative temper prevailed in Lutheran circles. The moderation of Wittenberg was a great offence both to Zurich and Geneva. Even when the Pope's bull had been fulminated against Luther, he continued to obstruct all sudden and radical changes. When during his stay at the Wartburg some of his more radical adherents, under the lead of Carlstadt, undertook to make the changes which he had hitherto prevented in the organization and worship of the Witten-

berg churches, he hastened home and threw all his energy into the work of opposing these premature efforts, and in temporarily restoring much that had been abolished, even although in some cases the change which had been made he knew must ultimately come when the people were prepared for it. When that time at last arrived his entire work of reorganization proceeded upon the principle that whatever had been developed in the experience of the Church that was not contrary to Holy Scripture, and that could be used to edification, was to be retained. An historical sense pervades Luther's attitude in doctrine, government and worship. The Holy Spirit's guidance, he believed, was not limited to the first period of the Christian Church, but, in accordance with his Master's promise, he recognized His presence as a permanent gift, to lead believers of all coming ages into all truth. He delighted to trace the testimony to Christ, as it was called forth in the experience of believers in all ages, in their application of Holy Scripture to the circumstances in which they were placed. From this standpoint he revised the formularies for Church worship when the task could be no longer postponed. His hymns are nearly all translations and paraphrases of Psalms, and Canticles and Latin hymns of the Ancient Church. He translated into the language of the people the collects and other prayers of the Missal and Breviary. The Orders for Ministerial Acts were very conservative revisions of the old offices. Only when the bishops, loyal to the Pope, refused to ordain candidates for the ministry for the evangelical churches, was the inherent right of these churches to provide for themselves pastors asserted and applied to practice by ordinations authorized by the congregations themselves. The Augsburg Confession devotes its longest article to the discussion of the Power of Bishops, ending with the protest that their authority would be cheerfully recognized, "provided they would not insist upon the observance of such tradi-

tions as cannot be kept with a good conscience," viz., such as the enforced celibacy of the clergy, the prohibition of evangelical truth, etc. "It is not our design," their article declares, "to wrest the government from the bishops, but this one thing is asked, namely, that they allow the Gospel to be purely taught, and that they relax some few observances which cannot be kept without sin." Even after twenty years had passed from the time of the first protest, in 1537, Melanchthon adds to his subscription to the Smalcald Articles: "Of the Pope, I hold, if he would allow the Gospel, that, for the sake of peace and the general unity of Christians, who are now under him, and may be under him hereafter, the superiority over bishops, which in other respects he has, could be allowed by us *de jure humano*." This concession, however, is not to be interpreted as of permanent validity, since with the lapse of time conditions change, and in the face of centuries of attack and persecution far more than the mere toleration of the Gospel would be required for the recognition of one, as a true representative of the Church.

Separated thus from the Church of Rome by the demand of unconditional submission to its decisions, which with a clear conscience could not be rendered, a time came when the long delayed reorganization of the Churches in Lutheran countries could be no longer postponed. To the very close of Luther's life the secret hope was cherished that the bishops might yet be won over to the evangelical side, and of themselves undertake this reorganization. Only temporary expedients had been resorted to, awaiting the realization of such a hope. There was no ambition to found a new Church as a rival of Rome, or even to bring together those who had sympathized with the movement that had started at Wittenberg into one international organization. To have done so would have obscured if not denied the very principles for which they were contending. All that was at-

tempted was that in every unit of civil government—for Germany was divided into numerous principalities, each of which was practically autonomous—where the evangelical doctrines had been received, new constitutions of Churches should be provided, in order to exclude the abuses against which they had protested, and to regulate the administration of Word and sacraments in accordance with the Gospel. These Constitutions were all of a conservative type, conforming not only to scriptural principles, but reverently following historical precedents; some were more, others less jealous of innovations. These attempts, made separately in the various Lutheran principalities and nations, as in the Scandinavian countries, were analogous to what was attempted at the same time in the English Reformation. The plan proposed in all these cases was neither to reorganize the Holy Catholic Church, as above defined, throughout the world, nor even to bring under one constitution those who in their hearts accepted the evangelical doctrine within each principality or nation, but simply, in a pressing emergency, to provide for the administration of the Means of Grace within certain territorial limitations, where political divisions afforded the bases for ecclesiastical adjustments. "Lutheran" at first was not the name of an organization, but of a particular type of doctrine; it indicated a mode of viewing and receiving and living the truths of Christianity. The official titles were determined by the various countries within which State Churches arose, as the Church of Sweden, of Denmark, of Norway, of Saxony, of Pomerania, of Würtemberg, etc., while their theological classification was determined by the doctrine on which their Constitutions rested.

These attempts, however, needful and undertaken with the purest motives, laboured under difficulties that prevented the attainment of many of their ideals. Much that the framers of these constitutions felt would be desirable had to be postponed for a later generation, when

the people would be prepared by the faithful inculcation of the principles already set forth for farther progress in their application. Great principles require centuries to mature and to yield the desired fruit. At the same time, in Lutheran countries, just as in England, the administration of the State Churches soon fell more or less completely into the hands of the sovereign and his State advisers. Germany, divided into numerous principalities—some of almost microscopic dimensions—was rich in *Kirchenordnungen*, or Church Constitutions, replete with details of administration, as each State made its own regulations—all of them, however, reducible to three or four clearly distinguishable types. While there is much in them that is purely provincial, as must necessarily occur in any State Church, the one bond of union between them is the common faith as embodied in the same Confessions that had been called forth by the historical conditions affecting more or less all of these lands.

As State Churches, it was not strange that the attention was almost completely absorbed in domestic problems. Even the most spiritually minded religious leaders found themselves overwhelmed with the spiritual development of the life of the masses under their care, and the furthering of the inner life of congregations. Schemes for wider union involving as they thought the surrender of aught of that for which they and their fathers had struggled could not be entertained. They were jealous of any efforts on the one hand of a more radical form of Protestantism, which would cut Lutheranism away from its historical foundations, and on the other hand were even more determined against the revised Romanism of the Council of Trent, which at last presented in definite form an authoritative statement of the errors that had called forth their protests, and which under threats of copious anathemas demanded the repudiation of what they held to be the pure Gospel. To them, all problems of oecumenical organization became

insignificant when compared with those of retaining inviolate the liberty from human traditions with which Christ had made them free. Nor was there among them the impulse to a closer bond of external union that they might have felt, if, according to their conception of the Church, they would have unchurched those to whom they did not give formal external recognition; for their Confessions teach, as we have above seen, that there are multitudes of earnest and devout people not reckoned in their congregations, but "scattered throughout the world from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof."

The problem, it must be acknowledged, meets us today in a somewhat different form from that in which it was pondered by our fathers centuries ago and under other conditions. The world has shrunk into comparatively narrow limits. The reign of provincialism and insularity is over. The increased facilities for travel introduced in modern times, and the rapidity with which information is diffused, bring nations and people and all the forces of intellectual, social and religious life throughout the world into touch with one another. The different types of Christianity meet not only in the mission field in their common efforts to convert the world to Christ, but in new lands such as ours where the population is composite. Representatives not only of different nations, but of different ecclesiastical bodies that are widely separated in the Old World, are here found dwelling side by side. Their agreements and differences come to light as they cannot in their former homes. As the people of whom the historical Churches are composed grow farther and farther distant from the lands whence they have brought their particular forms of religious life, is it possible for denominational lines to be perpetuated in America indefinitely? Must not that which is provincial—and therefore of human origin and authority—fall off, and that which is divine, the pure preaching of

the Word and the right administration of the sacraments alone abide, as the true basis of Church Union as well as the true test of the Church? Must not this inevitably result, as the religious life with its sense of the fellowship of all true believers deepens, and racial and national ties of a former period recede farther and farther into the dim distance? Under such conditions must not that which is purely accidental disappear, while only that which is essential remains?

Nevertheless, even if such suggestions be realized, is it not too much to expect that this growing unity will necessarily be expressed in one compact, thoroughly articulated organization? Even without a centralized government, is it not possible for Christians of the same or of diverse nationalties to rejoice in the evidences of the common faith that appear? Are not appeals made to the heart more potent than those which are enforced by external constraint? Is not love more effectual than the most minute code of laws? Is there any form of officialism comparable in influence to that of the possession of a common motive and a common aim? No attempt assuredly is useless that looks to the removal of misunderstandings or causes of offence among those who claim to be followers of the same Master.

We cannot more appropriately close this paper than in the language of the Formula of Concord—the last and most explicit of the Lutheran Confessions of the Sixteenth Century: "For that unity we entertain heartfelt pleasure and love, and this, on our part, we are sincerely inclined and anxious to advance according to our utmost power, by which His glory remains to God uninjured, nothing of the divine truth of the Holy Gospel is surrendered, no place is admitted for the least error, poor sinners are brought to true, genuine repentance, encouraged by faith, confirmed in new obedience, and thus justified and eternally saved alone through the sole merit of Christ."

"May Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, grant the grace of the Holy Spirit, that we all may be one in Him, and constantly abide in that Christian unity which is well-pleasing in His sight. Amen."

The Attempt at Union Between Greeks and Latins at the Council of Ferrara-Florence. (1438-1439)

By Canon Vacandard,
University of France.

The vague longings for a *rapprochement* between the Greek and the Latin Churches which had shown themselves in the first years of the fifteenth century grew and strengthened during the reign of John V (VII) Palæologus and the pontificate of Eugenius IV. The dissensions which arose at Basle between the Fathers of the Council and the Pontifical Sovereign threatened to compromise or even to ruin every attempt at union. But Eugenius took it upon himself to transfer the Council from Basle to Ferrara in spite of all resistance to the contrary (Dec. 30, 1437 or Jan. 1, 1438). His delegates were already in touch with the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople, who showed themselves well disposed to engage in discussions for union.[1]

On Jan. 8, 1438, Cardinal Nicholas Albergati, of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem, in the absence of the Pope, but at his order, opened the new Council in the Cathedral Church of Ferrara. A considerable number of prelates were already at this town, and many others arrived soon after. Eugenius IV made his solemn entry on the 27th of January.

The Greeks had left Constantinople towards the end

[1]We shall indicate in what follows the principal sources of this study.

of November 1437, and landed at Venice on February 8, 1438, where they were received with the greatest honours by the Doge, the Senate and the people. The Emperor was accompanied by the Patriarch, Bishops, priests, and officials, numbering altogether seven hundred persons. Besides the Bishops dependent on the Patriarchate of Constantinople, there were among the members of the Episcopate delegates from other Patriarchates of the East: Antonius, Metropolitan of Heraclea, and the Protosyncellus Gregory Hamma of Constantinople, for the Patriarch of Alexandria; the Archbishops Marcus Eugenicus of Ephesus, and Isidore of Kieff (Russia) for the Patriarch of Antioch; lastly, Dionysius, Bishop of Sardis, for the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Dionysius, who had died, was replaced later by Dositheus of Monembasia. Awaited with impatience at Ferrara the Greeks made their formal entry on the 4th or 7th of March.

Questions of etiquette and order had first to be attended to. While on the journey the Patriarch had been much troubled by the thought of the ceremonial customary in greeting the Pope. He had said: "If the Pope is older than myself, I will honour him as a father; if he is of the same age, I shall treat him as a brother; if he is younger, as a son." On reaching Ferrara he protested against the custom of kissing the foot of the Pope. Eugenius himself hastened to dispense him from it, with all the bishops and Greek dignitaries. The Pope greeted him himself, raising him, and permitting him to kiss him on the cheek; then seating himself he permitted the other bishops and dignitaries to kiss him on the hand and on the cheek. All were permitted by Eugenius to celebrate divine service according to their rite in the churches and chapels of Ferrara.

These questions settled, another no less delicate arose with regard to the ceremonial at the Council. The Greeks wished their Emperor to have precedence even of

the Sovereign Pontiff in the Synod of Union. After long debates the following arrangement was decided on: in the Cathedral of Ferrara, where the sessions of the Council were held, the Greeks should sit on the Epistle side, the Latins on the Gospel side, where a throne was set up for the Pope above all the other seats. At a lesser elevation was the seat of honour destined for the Western Emperor, though Sigismund had died a month before the opening of the Council (Dec. 9, 1437), and had as yet no successor; this empty seat symbolized at least the right pertaining to the Emperor of the West. On a lower level followed the seats of the Cardinals, then those of other bishops and Latin prelates. On the Epistle side reserved for the Greeks was a similar arrangement except for the space left free before the Papal throne. The seat of the Greek Emperor faced that of the Teutonic Emperor, and was adorned in the same way. The seat of the Patriarch, decorated in the same way as that of the Pope, was arranged at a level a little below his. The remaining seats of the Greeks corresponded to those of the Latins.

Preliminary matters having been arranged, the Council for Union was solemnly opened on April 9, 1438. The Patriarch of Constantinople was unable to assist at this session on account of illness, but in order to minimize as much as possible the effect of his absence he caused a letter to be read to the assembly in which he recognized the Synod and expressed the wish "that those of the West, and especially those who were present at Basle, would all appear at the Synod for Union at Ferrara." Nothing could better have shown his real desire for union.

Immediately after the celebration of Easter Eugenius several times requested that points of doctrine in dispute between the two Churches might be discussed. A commission of ten persons was then chosen from either side to examine these questions and to arrive at an

understanding. For this purpose the Greeks nominated Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus; Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicæa; the Bishops of Monembasia, Lacedæmon, and Anchielo, with two dignitaries (crucigeri) of Constantinople; Balsamon, the chief chartophylax; (recorder) and Syropulus, the chief ecclesiarch (one of the historians of the Council), with two abbots and a monk. To these ten ecclesiastics the Emperor added a secular prince, Manuel Jagaris. The Latin committee consisted of two cardinals: Guiliano Cesarini and Albergati; Andrew, Archbishop of Rhodes; John of Turrecremata, the Spanish Dominican, etc. Some notaries and interpreters were also appointed. Addresses and replies had to be drawn up in Latin and Greek by the notaries for the official reports.

Unfortunately these documents no longer exist. In their place, in order to follow the doings of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, we must have recourse to the accounts left by some historians who claim to have been eye-witnesses. In the first rank we may place a Greek author who wrote a history of the Council, following its acts, from which he gives us extracts. Although this history is anonymous we know that it is the work of Dorotheus, Archbishop of Mytilene;[2] it is printed in the ninth volume of Hardouin's collection and in the thirty-first volume of Mansi's collection. Another work has great similarities to the preceding; it is a collection published in 1638 by Orazio Giustiniani, the curator of the Vatican Library, comprising documents borrowed partly from notes by Andrew of Santa-Croce, the pontifical advocate, a member of the Council, and partly from fragments found in the archives of the Vatican and in several Roman libraries.[3] Lastly, our third and principal source is the account of Sylvester Syropulus, a Greek

[2]See Fromann's *Kritische Beitraege zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kircheneinigung*, Halle, 1872, pp. 46-82.

[3]In Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, coll. 669-1080. Missing in Mansi.

priest, an important ecclesiastic of the patriarchal Church of Constantinople. He attended the Synod from beginning to end in the suite of the Emperor and the Patriarch. He was one of those who, like Marcus Eugenicus, Metropolitan of Ephesus, desired no union with the Latins at whatever price. But for fear of the Emperor, and to flatter him, he subscribed to the decree which sanctioned it, free later in his account to misrepresent the acts and intentions not only of the Latins but even of the Greeks, his fellow-countrymen. His work appeared at The Hague in 1660 in a very indifferent Latin translation by Robert Creighton, the Anglican theologian, under the title of "*Vera Historia unionis non veræ inter Græcos et Latinos, sive concilii Florentini exactissima narratio græce scripta per Silvestrum Sguropulum,*" etc.[4]

II

The sessions were held in the Church of the Franciscans in Ferrara, Cardinal Cesarini at the opening holding a discourse in which he extolled union and exhorted all to labour earnestly for it. Many sessions were taken up with vain effusions.

At the third meeting Cardinal Cesarini pressed the Greeks vigorously to state their case. He enumerated four points of doctrine on which Greeks and Latins differed: (1) the procession of the Holy Spirit; (2) the question of the eucharistic azymes; (3) the doctrine of purgatory; (4) the papal primacy. By order of their Emperor the Greeks agreed to a discussion of the third and

[4]See Leo Allatius, *In Roberti Creygtoni apparatum, versionem et notas ad historiam concilii Florentini scriptam a silvestro Syropulu de unione inter Græcos et Latinos exercitationum pars prima, Romæ*, 1684; Joseph of Modon, *Responsio ad libellum Domini Marci Eugenici*, etc., in Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol, 9, col. 552. As second hand documents for the history of the Council of Ferrara-Florence the following may be mentioned, beside the work of Fromann (*Kritische Beitraege*, etc.), Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. 7, part 2, Paris, 1916, pp. 951-1051.

fourth articles only. So it happened that at the fourth session they had already arrived at the doctrine of purgatory.[5] The debates on this subject occupied the month of June and part of July. And the doctors of the two parties hardly succeeded in getting to understand one another.[6] Marcus Eugenicus experienced such disgust at these discussions that he made up his mind to leave Ferrara and return to Ephesus. The express orders of the Emperor alone induced him to resign himself to further attendance at the sessions.[7]

The discussions brought but meagre results. The Greeks wondered with what question the work of the Council of Union would begin. In order to come to a decision on this point the Emperor assembled his theologians privately and said to them: "Is it necessary in the Synod first of all to examine if the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed is dogmatically correct, or rather to have a preliminary discussion as to whether it is permissible to add even a single word to the Creed?" Evidently the point of most importance was whether the *Filioque* was dogmatically correct. This then should be first examined by the Council. Such was the opinion of Bessarion, Georgius Scholarius, Georgius Amyrutzès and of Syropulus himself. But Marcus Eugenicus and George Gemistus Plethon, the famous scholar, thought otherwise, and the majority of the members of the committee joined forces with them.[8]

Further the Greeks decided to take the offensive against the representatives of the Western Church in the debates which were approaching, and chose six learned protagonists: Bessarion, Marcus Eugenicus, Isidore of Kieff (Metropolitan of all Russia), George Gemis-

[5]Syropulus, *Vera historia unionis non veræ inter Græcos et Latinos*, ed. Creighton, pp. 118-124; Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, col. 18 sq.; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, col. 486 sq.

[6]Syropulus, op. cit., p. 140; Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, coll. 954-957.

[7]Syropulus, op. cit., pp. 144-152.

[8]Syropulus, op. cit. p. 159.

tus Plethon, Balsamon, the great scribarius or librarian, and Syropulus. (The latter declined the honour shown him, and was replaced by Theodore Xantopulos, the great curator of Constantinople.) In their turn the Latins nominated the two Cardinals Cesarini and Albergati, Andrew, the Archbishop of Rhodes, the Bishop of Forli, and some other theologians, one of whom was John of Ragusa, provincial of Lombardy.[9]

The 8th of October 1438, was chosen by the Pope for the first session. The Greeks would have preferred that it should be held in the Cathedral, but Eugenius, who was suffering from gout, opened it in the spacious chapel in his Palace. The order of precedence was the same as that observed in the Cathedral.

We cannot follow all these sessions in detail.[10] It will be sufficient for us to note the most important points discussed, and the chief arguments of each speaker, Greek or Latin. Marcus Eugenicus was the leader among the Greeks. On October 16, 1438, he read before the assembly the Nicene Creed and its confirmation by the third General Council, quoting the text of that Council: No one is permitted ἑτέραν πίστιν προσφέρειν. He endeavoured to prove that any addition to the Creed had by this been strictly forbidden. Anticipating an objection from the Latins, he continued, if the second General Council had made an addition, it was because the provision formulated by the Council of Ephesus did not yet exist. Marcus Eugenicus believed this interdiction to be confirmed by the acts of the fourth General Council of Chalcedon (Session 5), and by the declarations of subsequent Councils up to the seventh inclusive, and lastly by a letter of Pope Agatho.[11]

The Latins responded by producing a manuscript of

[9]Syropulus, op, cit. p. 161; Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9. pp. 25, 755; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, col. 495.

[10]For details see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. 7, part 2, p. 973 sq.

[11]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, col. 51 sq.; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, col. 527 sq.

the seventh General Council, in which the text of the Creed contained the word *Filioque*, from which they drew the conclusion that this Council had made the addition. Unfortunately the word was inserted. The argument therefore would not hold, and this was pointed out by George Gemistus Plethon.[12] The session closed then with victory for the Greeks.

At the following session (October 20) Cardinal Cesarini desired to appeal to the Eighth General Council which had recognized, at least implicitly, the *Filioque*. Marcus Eugenicus replied by a plea that this was not admissible, alleging that this Council was not numbered among the Ecumenical Councils by the Greeks. The Cardinal restricted himself then to the General Council of Chalcedon, which, while it forbade addition or subtraction from the Creed, nevertheless authorized the Fathers to explain what was already included in it. οὐδὲν προστιθέντες ἢ ἀφαιροῦντες, ἀλλὰ διασαφοῦντες· The Council had then admitted that an interpretation was permissible. And the *Filioque* was nothing but an interpretation or explanation.

The Archbishop of Rhodes insisted on this point. He tried to show that a simple elucidation of a passage of the Creed was not forbidden, and even could not be forbidden by the ancient Councils. In reality the Nicene Creed itself is but an *explanatio* of the Creed of the Apostles, that of Constantinople an *explanatio* of the Nicene, that of Ephesus an *explanatio* of the Nicene and the Constantinople Creeds, etc. To forbid a purely illustrative addition to the text of the Creed would be against the spirit of the Councils and even of the Greek Fathers. New heresies have always rendered explanations of the old creed useful or necessary, and he alone who has no faith in the promise of the Saviour to be with His Church unto the end of the world has a right to forbid them.[13]

[12]Syropulus, op. cit., p. 171.

[13]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, coll. 67-68; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, coll. 551-566.

Further the Roman Church in adding the *Filioque* simply expressed the teaching of the most illustrious of the Greek Fathers, especially of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom. And if she introduced this word into her Creed, it was to ward off the blow which certain Nestorians, in imitation of Theodoret, aimed at orthodoxy. This addition was at the time of its origin regarded with so little suspicion that Photius and other adversaries of Rome did not criticize it,[13a] and this they would not have failed to do if they had found anything irregular about it. The *Filioque* could not therefore be cited as a ground for the continuance of the schism which divides the Church of Christ.[14]

In the succeeding sessions Bessarion, Marcus Eugenicus and Cardinal Cesarini re-examined the same arguments without being able to arrive at an understanding. For the Greeks everything turned on the assertion that no addition, however correct and timely it might be, could be made to the Creed, even though it should contribute to the good of the Church and seem necessary to prevent heresy.[15] Bessarion, at least, recognized the dogmatic correctness of the *Filioque* (at the session of Nov. 1), and consequently the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father.[16] This was an important admission, which might serve as the point of departure for subsequent negotiations. But Marcus Eugenicus persisted in negations, and was disposed to end immediately all attempts at an understanding for union.

The Emperor was again obliged to intervene. The Patriarch, who had long been sick, having just risen, the Greeks held an extraordinary meeting in which, setting

[13a]The argument is inconclusive, for Photius did in fact attack the *Filioque*.

[14]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9., coll. 78-103; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, coll. 566-602.

[15]See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. 7, part 2, pp. 981-985.

[16]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9,pp. 103-123, 773-779; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, coll. 602-626.

aside the idea and tactics of Marcus Eugenicus, they resolved, on the advice of the Latins, to discuss the question of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The question was to be submitted for examination to a commission formed of twelve Latin and twelve Greek theologians.[17]

By this time (December 1438) life at Ferrara had for sanitary, financial and political reasons become almost insupportable. With the consent of the Emperor Eugenius transferred the Council to Florence.[18]

III

At the seventeenth session of the Council (the first at Florence), on February 26, 1439, it was decided to abandon the discussion of the expediency and legality of the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed, in order to take up the question of the dogmatic value of this addition.[19] And on March 2, and again on March 5, John of Ragusa and Marcus Eugenicus fenced with one another on this point. The texts cited by John of Ragusa to prove that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father were taken from St. Epiphanius (*Ancoratus*, C. LXXIII) and from St. Basil (*Adversus Eunomium* Book III). According to the latter, if the Holy Spirit "in dignity comes after the Son, He has His εἶναι ἐξ αὐτοῦ, His Being from the Son." Marcus Eugenicus replied that these words signified that the Holy Spirit takes His Being not from the Person of the Son but from His Substance, that is to say, that they are consubstantial. On the 7th of March he returned to this explanation, and in order to cut short all further discus-

[17]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, col. 831 sq.

[18]See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. 7, pp. 986-987; Fromann, *Kritische Beitraege zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kircheneinigung*, p. 24 sq.

[19]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, coll. 178-190; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, coll. 702-718; Syropulus, *Vera historia unionis non veræ*, etc., p. 216.

sion, he disputed the authenticity of the words, and claimed that the passage in question had been inserted later to support the doctrine of the *Filioque*. John of Ragusa responded that the passage just as cited was found in a manuscript that Nicholas of Cusa had brought from Constantinople, which was more than six hundred years old, and consequently belonged to an age prior to that of the conflict relating to the *Filioque*.[20] Further other Greek manuscripts contained the same. If some did not, it was because they had been deliberately expurgated. Marcus Eugenicus could not deny that he knew of certain manuscripts which contained the words in question,[21] but he nevertheless persisted in affirming that they were not authentic. The dispute having taken this turn had no chance of reaching a conclusion.

John of Ragusa carried the debate into another field.[22] Admitting the authenticity of the Greek and Latin texts in favour of the *Filioque*, John declared that the Latin Church nevertheless recognized only one principle and one cause of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The Greeks favouring union produced in support of this a letter of St. Maxim, in which he says: "If the Latins teach that the Spirit also proceeds from the Son, they do not claim therefore that the Son is the cause (*αἰτία*) of the Spirit, for they recognize but one source of Son and Holy Spirit, and that is the Father."[23] This doctrine needed explaining and defining later, but from that moment it became a basis for agreement. The public sessions of the Council were thereupon brought to a close.[24] (The twenty-fifth session, March 24, 1439.)

[20]Hardouin, *loc. cit.*, coll. 190-226, 872-881; Mansi, *loc. cit.*, 718-767.

[21]On the falsification of texts by certain Greeks see the anecdote told by Joseph of Modon, in Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, col. 568, and compare Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. 7, part 2, p. 990, note 3.

[22]See Hefele-Leclercq, Ibid., pp. 991-993.

[23]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 9, coll. 306-309, 927-938; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, coll. 878-880.

[24]Hardouin, Ibid., coll. 939-951; Mansi, Ibid., col. 882 sq.

IV

On March 30, 1439, Monday in Holy Week, the Patriarch assembled at his residence the bishops of the East to examine if they could not before Easter by common consent find a *modus unionis* or if they must give up all hope of an understanding.

Isidore of Kieff and Bessarion at once spoke in favour of union, both showing later the sincerity of their zeal for union. Dositheus of Monembasia having written "that he would rather die than become latinized," Isidore replied honestly: "Neither do we wish to be latinized, but the Fathers of the East also teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son; therefore it is proper that we should come to an agreement on this point with the Latin Church." Antonius of Heraclea and Marcus Eugenicus protested energetically against such a step. The latter treated the Latins as heretics, with whom it was impossible to unite, if they did not first erase the *Filioque* from their Creed. Bessarion rightly observed "that it followed that the Greek Fathers who had taught the same doctrine ought also be considered as heretics"; to which Marcus Eugenicus replied: "Certainly, either they are heretics, or their books have been altered."[25]

Confusion had taken possession of their spirits, and if the Emperor had not raised obstacles in their way the opponents of union with Marcus Eugenicus at their head would have set out for Constantinople without delay. The discussions continued, however, during Holy Week and Easter Week, but without animation.[26]

Finally, on April 13 and 14, at the Greek assembly, Bessarion made a great speech[27] which led to a revival of the zeal of the unionists. A short introduction developed this thought: "All here love peace and the union of

[25]Hardouin, *Ibid*, col. 311 sq.; Mansi, *loc. cit.*, col. 886 sq.

[26]See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. 7, part 2, pp. 996-998.

[27]To be found in Hardouin, *loc. cit.* coll. 319-372, and in Mansi, *loc. cit.* coll. 894-964.

Christendom. We are only divided on the means to be used to obtain it."

Bessarion continuing related how unity, which had previously existed, had been disturbed by the addition of the *Filioque*, which the Latins had inserted in the Creed. Such an addition should not have been made except by a General Council. But the mistake could be repaired. For today a General Council was being held, and Greeks and Latins had loyally set forth their case. The Greeks would then be greatly at fault if they did not lend themselves to the work of re-establishing union. They had no right simply to say (like Marcus Eugenicus): "We do not desire union," but it was their duty to examine the arguments of the Latins, and to retain what they found to be right and acceptable. Now, if the Fathers of the East teach that "the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father," or even "from the Father through the Son," and the Latins "from the Father and the Son," there is no contradiction, for none of the Fathers of the East affirm that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son. The preposition "by" (διά) always denotes an instrumental cause. The Father and the Son are the same *productiva potentia* and consequently the expression *per Filium* simply means that the Father co-operates actively in the procession of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, if a number of the Greek Fathers, St. Basil, St. Athanasius, St. Gregory of Nyssa, etc., teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds *ex Patre per Filium*, others, particularly Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius or even St. Basil, have said *ex* as well as *per* to express the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son. And either expression may be employed indifferently without the doctrine being in any way affected. It should not be forgotten that the Latins do not admit two sources (ἀρχαὶ and αἰτία) of the Holy Spirit; they hold that the Father and the Son are together the one source of the procession; they openly declare that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the

Father *per Filium* and *ex Filio*. To accuse them of having forged the passages of the Greek Fathers who teach that the Spirit proceeds from or by the Son, is to be inexact and foolish. Unity is therefore possible, it is infinitely desirable. And who can oppose it, if unity of faith exists?

When Bessarion had finished his discourse, George Scholarius in his turn spoke in favour of union.[28] And his action is the more remarkable, his language the more striking, because he later denied them and joined the group of anti-unionists led by Marcus Eugenicus.[29]

We will refrain from entering into details of the tedious controversies carried on by Greeks and Latins between April 15 and May 30. The subject of dispute was invariably the same.[30] At last in an assembly of the Greeks, at which the Emperor and the Patriarch were present, George Scholarius again compared the texts of the Fathers of East and West in order to show that in spite of certain differences of expression they agreed fundamentally. Thereupon each was invited to give his opinion. The Patriarch expressed himself thus: "Having heard the texts of the Fathers of East and West, and seeing the one say *ex Patre et Filio*, and the others *ex Patre per Filium*, and that the two terms *ex Filio* and *per Filium* have the same meaning, we declare (in conformity with our usage) that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by the Son *æternaliter et substantialiter*, *tanquam ab uno principio et causa*, and that the preposition *per*, διά here signifies the *causa* of the *processio Spiritus Sancti*." But, he added, it is not necessary to introduce the words *ex Filio* into the Greek Creed. On condition that they should retain all their own rites the Greeks agreed to unite with the Latins.

[28]He made three speeches which may be read in Hardouin, *loc. cit.* 446-550, and in Mansi, *loc. cit.* col. 1066 sq.

[29]See Hardouin, *Ibid*, col. 374, and Mansi, *Ibid*, col. 967.

[30]See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. 7, pp. 1001-1007.

The Emperor hereupon declared that as a layman he submitted to the decision of the General Council, and as Emperor he would uphold this decision, although the Church was infallible with regard to dogmatic decrees carried *synodaliter*. But nothing ought to be added to the Creed of the Greeks nor should their rites be changed.

Isidore of Kieff, Bessarion and Dorotheus of Mytilene approved of these resolutions highly. Dorotheus remarked that if in his youth he had striven against the Latins it was because he had believed that they admitted two αἰτίας in the Trinity; but since in reality East and West were agreed to teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son as one source, there was no longer anything to prevent union. Other Greek prelates expressed themselves with less precision.

At first ten Bishops only declared themselves in favour of union, namely, the Bishops of Kieff, Nicæa, Lacedæmon, Mytilene, Rhodes, Nicomedia, Distra, Ganos, Drama and Melenik, with Gregory Mammas, the great protosyncellus, who represented the Patriarch of Alexandria. Some days later most of these who had held back joined their colleagues, for instance, the Bishops of Cyzicus, Trebizond, Heraclea and Monembasia.[31] Marcus Eugenicus alone refused to become one of the partisans of union.[32]

The definite drawing up of a dogmatic formula on the procession of the Holy Spirit was accomplished by common consent of Greeks and Latins on Sunday, June 7, 1439. The two texts, in Greek and Latin, having been ratified by all, the Pope hastened to inform the Emperor of the happy event.[33]

---

[31]Hardouin, *Concilia*, vol. 7, coll. 391-398 and 592 sq; Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. 31, coll. 990-998; Syropulus, *Vera historia unionis non veræ*, etc., p. 260 ff.

[32]Hardouin, *loc. cit.* coll. 398-402; Mansi, *loc. cit.* coll. 998-1002, Syropulus, *op. cit.* pp. 256-268.

[33]See Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, pp. 1011-1012.

V

On Tuesday, June 9, the Emperor sent as his delegates to the Pope the four Metropolitans of Kieff, Nicæa Trebizond, and Mytilene. Eugenius IV made the following declaration to them: "By the grace of God we now agree on the principal points of dogma; but in order to remove all error we ought still to examine together questions regarding purgatory, the primacy, leavened bread or azymes and the sacrifice of the Mass. The questions of purgatory and azymes indeed required but a short explanation, and here an understanding was easily arrived at.[34] It was not so easy to define the primacy of the Pope. Discussion was once more resumed with renewed ardour.

Meanwhile the Patriarch had died. His death became known on June 10,[35] and at the same time a document was discovered in his room which was, so to say, his testament in favour of union. Though the paper may have been regarded by some historians as apocryphal there is good reason for believing its authenticity.[36] Its tenor is as follows: "Joseph, by divine mercy Archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch. Having reached the end of my days, and on the point of paying the debt common to humanity, I desire, by the grace of God, openly to set forth in writing to my sons in the faith what I profess and to place my signature to it. All that is taught by the Catholic and Apostolic Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which is in the Old Rome, that I confess, and I solemnly declare that I accept it all. I also recog-

[34]For these negotiations see Hefele-Leclercq, vol. 7, pp. 1012-1014, 1019-1027.

[35]He was buried in the Church of Santa Maria Novella.

[36]The work is known by the name of *Extrema sententia.* With regard to its authenticity see Fromann, *Kritische Beitræge zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kircheneinigung*, p. 83 sq.; and especially Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, col. 7, pp. 1014-1019.

nize the Holy Father of Fathers, the Supreme Pontiff and representative of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Pope of Ancient Rome. Believing which I sign, the 9th of June of the second indiction."

That the Patriarch was disposed to sign the decree of union, and even to recognize the primacy of the Pope no one in Florence doubted. It remained to determine the formula which would command the approval of Greeks and Latins. After many fruitless discussions[37] a debate was officially arranged between Bessarion and John of Ragusa for the 20th and 21st of June.

The latter quoted from some old papal letters which had been received with every honour by the General Councils and especially by the Council of Chalcedon. To these Bessarion replied that "these were polite attentions which proved nothing in favour of the Papal Primacy, which should be established not by pontifical letters but by canons of the Synod." Whereupon John of Ragusa undertook to show that these pontifical letters had as much as and even more authority than the canons of the Councils, provided that the General Councils had made them the basis of their dogmatic decisions. He then passed to the question raised by Bessarion, namely, if the words: "the Pope is *pater et doctor et magister Christianorum*," express simply a primacy of honour, or more, as is indicated by the words *Caput Ecclesiæ*. The speaker showed clearly that the *preeminentia* of the Pope denotes not only *reverentiam*, *sed potestatem quandam cujusdam obedientiæ* (that is to say, primacy of a jurisdiction), and he proved the existence of this primacy by the words of Christ: *Pasce oves meas* and *Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum*. He added that clergy and laity are subject to this *potestas spiritualis jurisdictionis*, the laity *in his quæ concernunt salutem animarum*. This primacy also implies that the Bishops, unjustly persecuted by an Emperor, may appeal to the Pope, as did

[37]See Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.* pp. 1020-1023.

Athanasius, John Chrysostom, etc. And such a recourse was not an encroachment on the rights of the Emperor, for the Imperial power is exercised *in civilibus et temporalibus*, while that of the Pope is *ecclesiastica et spiritualis*. To the question put by the Emperor: Does the power of the Pope include the right *convocare Ecclesiam* (in a General Council)? John of Ragusa replied in the affirmative; he observed that if the emperors did convoke certain Councils, it was only done with the consent of or at the wish of the Holy See; which he proved by examples.[38] He concluded by saying that Christ gave to His Church the better constitution, namely the monarchical, but that the Roman Church has no intention of infringing the rights and privileges of other Churches.

In the name of the Emperor Bessarion had also asked "if the power of the Pope is analogous to that of a Metropolitan in his Province or to that of a Patriarch in his Patriarchate." John of Ragusa replied: "No, for the power of a Metropolitan or of a Patriarch is limited to the territory which he administers, while that of the successor of Peter possesses *immediatam potestatem in omnes*. Nevertheless it should be added that the Pope possesses this power, *ita ut cum ordine hæc omnia fiant*. The speaker, therefore, regarded the bishops simply as delegates of the Pope, since Peter could not do everything for the establishment in many countries of bishops, metropolitans and patriarchs. This last assertion was based on the words of Anacletus taken from the pseudo-Isidore and on the so-called *Donatio Constantini*. John of Ragusa ended with these words: *Ideo sextus canon Nicæni concilii dicit quod semper Ecclesia Romana tenuit principatum.*

It is to be regretted that the advocate of the Primacy should have used these apocryphal texts. It is untrue

[38]On this special point see Funk, *Die Berufung der œkumenischen Synoden des Altertums*, in *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*, Paderborn, 1893, pp. 39-86.

that the Council of Nicæa ever proclaimed the primacy of the Roman Church, and John of Ragusa should have known that Laurentius Valla and Nicholas of Cusa had already shown that the *Donatio Constantini* was not authentic.[39]

In spite of all this, the Greeks showed themselves disposed to recognize the prerogatives of the Pope, except two, namely: that the Pope may, without the concurrence of the Emperor and the other Patriarchs, hold a General Council, and that a Patriarch, whose decision is carried in appeal to Rome, may be obliged to appear in person before the tribunal of the Sovereign Pontiff; in these cases, they said, the Pope should send judges to the territory of the Patriarch.

The day following this declaration, that is to say, on the 22nd of June, Eugenius made it known that he intended to preserve all the prerogatives attaching to his see, as well the right of appeal as the *regere et pascere Christi Ecclesiam uti ovium pastorem;* he maintained that he had the right to convoke General Councils when these appeared to him to be necessary, and that all the Patriarchs owed him obedience. The Emperor responded to the Pope with this threat: "Prepare for our departure."[40]

Those in favour of union were in consternation. Nevertheless, some of them, especially Isidore of Kieff, Bessarion and Dorotheus of Mytilene, did not give up hopes of a renewal of negotiations; they at once got into communication with both the Pope and the Emperor, and indicated a new way of conferring. Four commissioners of each Church should draw up a *chartula* or minutes, in which should be recorded their doctrines and their claims. The Greeks met in the dwelling of the Em-

[39]See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles,* vol. 1, pp. 552, 562, 566, ff.; Düx, *Der deutsche Cardinal Nikolas von Cusa und die Kirche seiner Zeit,* 1847. Vol. 1, p. 109 and Vol. 2, p. 301.

[40]Hardouin, *Concilia,* Vol. IX. col. 411 ff.; Mansi, *Concilia,* Vol. XXXI, col. 1018 ff.

peror, and unanimously signed the following declaration: "Relative to the ἀρχὴ of the Pope, we recognize that he is the sovereign priest and administrator (ἄκρον, ἀρχιερέα και ἐπίτροπον) representing it, and the delegate of Christ, the pastor and doctor of all Christians, that he leads and governs the Church of God, nevertheless without prejudice to the privileges and rights of the Patriarchs of the East."

It appears that the Latins, in order that union might not be delayed, accepted, at least in principle, the proposals of their Eastern colleagues. In any case, on Saturday, June 27, the Pope deputed the Bishops of Crete, Rhodes and Coron to the Greeks to announce to them that the *tomus definitionis* (decree of union) should be drawn up in Latin and Greek on the morrow, and signed by all, and that on Monday the 29th, the feast of the Holy Apostles, the union should be proclaimed at a solemn Mass.[41]

VI

The drawing up of the decree of union caused more difficulty than had been anticipated. It was hard to come to an agreement on the bases of papal primacy and on the prerogatives of the patriarchs.[42]

In the first draft the Pope figured alone at the head of the decree. On the demand of the Emperor, the name of the Emperor was coupled with his, and the Patriarchs and their representatives were mentioned. Finally this formula was agreed on: *Eugenius episcopus servus servorum, consentiente ad infra scripta carissimo filio nostro Joanne Palæologo, Romanorum imperatore illustri, locatenentibus venerabilium fratrum nostrorum patriarcarum, et ceteris orientalem Ecclesiam repræsentantibus.*

The decree represented the prerogatives of the Patri-

[41]Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.* pp. 1025-1028.
[42]*Ibid.*, pp. 1028-1030.

archs in this form: *salvis juribus et privilegiis patriarcharum.* The Greeks added the word *omnibus.* To which the Latins protested: they feared that a sense might be attributed to the word *omnibus* which might strain the character of the hierarchical relations between the Patriarchs of the East and the Head of the Universal Church, for example, "all the privileges usurped by the Patriarchs during the schism." After some explanation the Latins gave way and the word *omnibus* was retained.

The text of the decree defined the primacy of the Pope according to the *dicta sanctorum sanctamque Scripturam.* The *dicta sanctorum* shocked the Greeks who proposed the following form: *juxta canones, sacramque Scripturam et acta synodorum.* The formula was presented to the Pope who agreed to it. How and why it was finally changed into the following we are unable to say: *Quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur;* the traces of this change are nowhere to be found.

The feast of the Apostles, however, passed. At the demand of the Emperor it was agreed that on Thursday, July 2, six deputies of each party should meet and draw up the *tomus* in Greek and Latin, in diptych form. On the right side should be engraved the Latin text, signed by the Latins and sealed with the Pontifical seal; the Greeks would sign on the left and the Emperor would attach his golden seal.

The text of the decree was definitely drawn up in Greek and Latin by Ambrosius Traversari with the approval of Bessarion. It may therefore be said that it was the work of Greeks and Latins in common. It would be useless to discuss the question as to which of the two versions is really the original; both are of equal documentary value.[43]

On Sunday July 5, the Greeks signed the decree of

[43]On this question see Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.* p. 1032, note 2.

union in the dwelling of the Emperor (the Peruzzi Palace) in the presence of three Latin Bishops and a protonotary. Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus, refused to sign. Syropulus, who was nevertheless an avowed opponent of the union, signed, but as he himself said, for fear of the Emperor.[44]

On the same day, July 5, the Latins also signed the decree in the monastery of Santa-Maria-Novella (where Eugenius IV resided) in the presence of ten Greek witnesses. And in the evening the Greeks again waited upon the Pope at his special invitation. There in the presence of all assembled Bessarion made the following solemn declaration with reference to consecration: "The Greek Church teaches the dogma of transubstantiation, and this transubstantiation is accomplished by virtue of the words of Christ, as taught by St. John Chrysostom."[45] In view of the importance of this profession of faith, we may ask why it did not figure in the decree of union.

The decree of union was solemnly published on July 6 (1439), the octave of the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul during divine service in the Cathedral of Florence. Cardinal Cesarini read it in the Latin tongue, Bessarion in Greek. The text is as follows:[46]

Definitio sanctæ œcumenicæ synodi Florentinæ.

Eugenius episcopus etc.

Lætentur cœli et exultet terra: sublatus est enim de medio paries qui occidentalem orientalemque dividebat Ecclesiam. . . . Diffinimus ut hæc fidei veritas ab omnibus christianis credatur et suscipiatur, sicque omnes profiteantur quod Spiritus sanctus ex Patre et Filio æter-

[44]Syropulus, *Vera historia unionis non veræ*, etc., pp. 291-294.

[45]The full text of the Declaration is in Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, pp. 1031-1032, and note.

[46]Only the definitions are given. For the full text, both Latin and Greek, see Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.* pp. 1037-1043.

naliter est, et essentiam suam suumque esse subsistens habet ex Patre simul et Filio, et ex utroque æternaliter tanquam ab uno principio et unica spiratione procedit, . . . Diffinimus insuper explicationem verborum illorum Filioque veritatis declarandæ causa et imminente tunc necessitate licite ac rationaliter symbolo fuisse appositam.

Item, in azymo sive fermentato pane triticeo, corpus Christi veraciter confici, sacerdotesque in altero ipsum Domini corpus conficere debere, unumquemque scilicet juxta suæ Ecclesiæ sive occidentalis sive orientalis consuetudinem.

Item, si vere pœnitentes in Dei caritate decesserint, antequam dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, eorum animæ pœnis purgatoriis post mortem purgari, et ut a pœnis hujusmodi releventur prodesse eis fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes et eleemosynas et alia pietatis officia quæ a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus fieri consueverunt secundum Ecclesiæ instituta, etc. . . . .

Item diffinimus sanctam Apostolicam sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi, ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.

Renovantes insuper ordinem traditum in canonibus ceterorum venerabilium patriarcharum; ut patriarcha Constantinopolitanus secundus sit post sanctissimum Romanum pontificem, tertius vero Alexandrinus, quartus autem Antiochenus et quintus Hierosolymitanus, salvis videlicet pivilegiis omnibus et juribus eorum.

Datum Florentiæ, etc.

The signatures of the Latins were below the Latin text. The Pope signed as the first; after him eight Cardinals, the two Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Grado, sixty-one Archbishops and Bishops, and forty-three Abbots or heads of orders; in all one hundred and fifteen signatures. It should be noted that the Pope alone used the formula: *diffiniens subscripsi.*

Below the Greek text were the signatures of the Emperor, the representatives of the Patriarchs, the Archbishops, the Bishops and a dozen prelates; in all thirty-three signatures.[47] That of the Emperor was: Ἰω ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ πιστὸς βασιλεὺς και αὐτωκράτωρ Ρωμαίων ὁ Παλαιολόγος ὑπέγραφα.

A certain number of copies of the decree were made in both Greek and Latin. Some Greek copies do not contain the words corresponding to the *in universum orbem tenere primatum,* referring to the primacy of the Sovereign Pontiff. Hefele explains this omission as an error of the copyist misled by the words *Romanum Pontificem* which recur in the next line. Similarly the words *Quemadmodum etiam* which correspond to the Greek καθ' ὅν τρόπον καὶ have been subject of dispute and it has been maintained that the Greek text signifies that the primacy of the Pope should be accepted in the restricted sense determined by the acts of the Councils and the holy canons; while the Latin formula would suppose that the Councils have already defined the primacy in a way which agrees with the attitude of the Council of Florence. Notwithstanding it is certain that the Latin text which we have reproduced represents the original one preserved at Florence under glass at the Laurentian Library.[48]

The union was then solemnly sealed. Nevertheless Eugenius IV would have wished in order to complete it, that the Greeks should have renounced the dissolution

[47]Andrew of Santa-Croce is mistaken in saying that forty-six Greek prelates signed. Hardouin, *Concilia,* Vol. IX. col. 991.

[48]On the differing copies of the decree and their various readings see Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.,* pp. 1044-1051. On the *Quemadmodum etiam* in particular consult the same, pp. 1044-1046.

of marriages, which they allowed through a false interpretation of the words in St. Matthew (Chap. 19: 3-9) and in St. Mark (Chap. 10: 2-12); that they would punish Marcus Eugenicus, who had shown himself to be hostile to union; and lastly that they would proceed to the election of a Patriarch to replace the one who had died. The Emperor refused to comply with these wishes.[49] As a pledge of good-will the Greeks promised to insert the name of the Pope in their diptychs, but in return they demanded that in the Greek dioceses where there was a Latin bishop, the latter should submit to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The request seemed to Eugenius IV to be excessive, and he agreed only to the following compromise: each mixed diocese in which the Latin Bishop died first, should belong henceforth to the Patriarch of Constantinople; but if the Greek Bishop died first, the diocese should fall to the Patriarch of Rome.[50] All being thus settled the Emperor left Florence on August 20, 1439, and took the road to Constantinople by way of Venice.

VII

On his return to his capital, the Emperor's first duty was to publish the decree of union signed at Florence. But were minds prepared to receive it? While the project was being discussed in the West, nothing had been done in the East to effect a *rapprochement*. Therefore the Emperor found himself face to face with an opposition which appeared to be absolutely unconquerable. The opposition of the monks, who knew little of the decisions of the Council, in Constantinople and throughout the Empire, reached the last degree of exaltation. Marcus Eugenicus stirred up passions. The new Patri-

[49]On these closing negotiations between the Greeks and the Latins see Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, pp. 1046-1048

[50]Syropulus, *Vera historia unionis non veræ*, etc., pp. 302-305.

arch, Metrophanes II (1440-1445), an avowed partisan of union, as well as the Emperor, spent efforts entirely in vain. In 1443, the Patriarchs Philotheus of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch and Joachim of Jerusalem published a synodal paper against him, in which they inveighed against him, called him a parricide and heretic, declared that they considered as divested of office the clergy whom he had ordained, named as executor of their decisions the Metropolitan of Cæsarea, and threatened the Emperor himself with excommunication. They declared the Council of Florence to be false, tyrannical and anti-canonical.[51]

In Russia alone the decree of union had some success. Isidore of Kieff caused his suffragans of Brjansk, Smolensk, Peremitjsch, Turow, Luzk, Wladimir, Polotsk, Chelm and Halitsch to accept it. Nevertheless Russia proper, of which Moscow was the capital, remained obstinately refractory to union, and finally Isidore of Kieff paid for his zeal by imprisonment and exile. In September 1443 he sought refuge in Rome.[52]

John Palæologus and Metrophanes died in harness. Their successors were not much more fortunate. The Patriarch Gregory III Mammas or Melissene (July 1445) who also favoured union, seeing round him nothing but discord and growing dangers, resigned his charge in 1451 and went to end his days in Rome.

The Emperor Constantine XI, who had succeeded his brother in 1449, turned to the successor of Eugenius IV to implore his help against the Turks who were becoming more and more of a menace. He excused himself for the delay which had occurred in the work of union. The Pope replied that he was not deceived by the tergiversations of the court at Byzantium, and that the troubles

---

[51]Banduri, *Antiquitates Constantinopolit.*, Vol. II. p. 960; Mansi, *Concilia*, Supplem. Vol. V. pp. 297-298.

[52]See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, Vol. VII., pp. 1228-1229, notes.

of the Empire were a chastisement for the schism. At any cost the decree of Florence which the Greeks had till then buried in silence must be solemnly promulgated. Otherwise Constantinople could not count on the help of the West.[53]

This severe language was not calculated to calm the irritation of the Eastern Church, which was already not any too well disposed to the court of Rome. Nevertheless an attempt at an understanding was made.

Nicholas V sent to Constantinople Isidore of Kieff, who, in spite of the difficulties raised by the monks, was able to celebrate the feast of union at St. Sophia on December 12, 1452, in the presence of the Emperor, a numerous congregation of grand personages and nearly three hundred ecclesiastics. The names of the Patriarchs of East and West were recited in the diptychs. But the ceremony remained purely official; it attained no popularity. "What need have we of union and of the Latins?" cried the objectors. "Away with the worship and the liturgy of the azymes." From that time the anti-unionists considered the basilica of St. Sophia profaned and refused to enter it, and people, even to the first minister of the Empire, declared they would rather see in Constantinople the turban of Mahomet than the tiara of the Pope or the hat of a cardinal.

Mahomet II was soon to put an end to these internal divisions. He blockaded Constantinople by land and water. The pontifical troops, Venetians and Genoese, with their fleets, came it is true, to the help of the besieged. But on May 29, 1453 the Turks carried the city by assault. The Emperor Constantine was slain in the combat. With him perished the Greek Empire; St. Sophia became a mosque.[54] Thereupon the project for

[53]The papal Bull is dated Oct. 11, 1452 in Raynaldi, *Annales, ad ann.* 1451, Nos. 1-2. See Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, pp. 1233-1235, note.

[54]Hefele-Leclercq, *ibid.*; Walter Adeney, The Greek and Eastern Churches, Edinburgh, 1908, pp. 268-270.

union between Greeks and Latins vanished as a dream not soon to return.

There are nevertheless no serious reasons why it should not one day become a reality. The great minds of the fifteenth century recognized that the questions of doctrine and discipline which separated the East and the West could be amicably settled. It was matters of custom, habits, diversity of race and language, and, why not say also, passions of individuals that brought about the miscarriage of union. Would these obstacles be insurmountable? In these later times a *rapprochement* of the nations has taken place which tends to bring together also the Christian individuals and communities. This is one step towards unity. Let men of good will set themselves to work.

The Education of the Clergy and Reunion

By F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., F.R.Hist. S.,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.

In our attempts to bring about the reunion of Christendom we have, I believe, always begun at the wrong end. As a rule we have gathered together the older men who have been highly successful in their respective Churches and united them to devise plans to bring the Churches of the future into a union unknown in the past. Now when a man rises to a high place of dignity in a religious community, he usually retains a good deal of human nature in his elevation. Naturally he feels considerable admiration for the wisdom of an institution which has recognized his merits; and a long life spent in its service has deepened his affection for his Church. Ingrained prejudices make him inelastic in his attitude to other bodies of Christians, especially after a lifelong rivalry with them, and if he has become tolerant it is probably due to his indolence rather than to his breadth of mind. Again old men are disposed to conserve prejudices which a later age scarcely comprehends, and when it comes to discussing such a subject as reunion, they are either disposed to suggest that people should come together on questions which meant much several decades ago but have long been without significance; or they make these things mountains of division, though to the present generation they are but molehills.

To secure union it seems advisable to begin with the young and work forward, in preference to working back-

ward with the old. Let us leave the conference and betake ourselves to the schools, and secure the desired end by turning to the young rather than to the aged. Next to the diffusion of a more Christ-like spirit among professed Christians, there are two factors which make for unity—evangelistic and social work, and scholarship. Of the first I do not propose to speak. It is being tried, and with a great measure of success, preeminently by the great modern missionary societies, and by other organizations such as the Student Movement, the Salvation Army and the Y. M. C. A. These and other societies have done much to allay sectarian prejudice and to encourage religious bodies to join in some common aim, but the educational side has been partly neglected, and has not, to my judgment, met with the success it might have secured. To this, therefore, I propose to confine my remarks.

A man who gives his own experiences runs the risk of being reproached as an egotist and a bore. Nevertheless I am ready to take this risk, because what is personal to oneself has at least the merit of bearing directly on the subject under discussion. I will, therefore, give my own testimony from first-hand knowledge as to the intellectual training of candidates for the ministry.

My experience has been twofold, but very unevenly divided, consisting of almost a lifetime in my own country and university, and a few months in America. It began in the autumn of 1882 when I was appointed lecturer in Divinity and Hebrew at Jesus College, Cambridge, in succession to Dr. Luckock, afterwards Dean of Lichfield. It was at the time when the new statutes of the university had come into operation, by which the old clerical predominance was finally abolished and the university made a secular instead of an ecclesiastical institution. Strangely enough the change resulted in enhancing rather than diminishing the importance of the study of theology. Up to the middle of the nine-

teenth century the education of a clergyman of England was almost entirely secular. Safeguarded by tests, compelled to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, holding his fellowship as a rule by taking holy orders soon after he obtained it, taught almost exclusively by clergymen and educated in colleges where almost everyone entered the ministry, the orthodoxy of the student was considered certain; and, provided he satisfied the university examiners, bishops troubled but little about his theological acquirements. There was a story current when I was young of an examining chaplain who used to say to the examinees, "Gentlemen who are fellows of colleges will put their papers on this chair, graduates on that, members of no university on that." The papers done by fellows were never looked at and only those in the last category seriously examined. None of the divinity professors had received a special education in theology. Westcott and Lightfoot were both senior classics and began their careers as classical teachers. Hort graduated in classics and mathematics, and obtained a first class in natural science and, I believe, also in moral science. The field in which these three won their fame and added to that of their university was tilled by their unaided efforts. It had always been thus both at Oxford and Cambridge. I think I am correct in saying that I was the first in either university to obtain a fellowship solely on a degree in theology; for to my lasting regret, I did not first take the Classical Tripos.

The college to which I had the honour of being admitted as a teacher had from the first a reputation for high churchmanship. One of its earliest fellows was Thomas Cranmer, whose labours in translating the ancient prayers of the church have merited the gratitude of the English speaking world. Under Elizabeth Jesus College was suspected of popish leanings, and later Archbishop Bancroft, the bitterest of the anti-puritans, was tutor. Under James I its master was brother to

Bishop Andrewes; in the days of Charles I Dr. Sterne, as master, was one of the few in Cambridge who sacrificed the college plate to the royal necessities. He was rewarded by the Archbishopric of York; but his chief title to fame was that he was the ancestor of Laurence Sterne, himself a scholar of the college. In the eighteenth century that great scholar Dr. Ashton, known as "the Critic," presided for half a century and was in constant opposition to Dr. Bentley, the famous but most hated master of Trinity. Later the college numbered among its fellows divines accused of Arianism, and of being friends of Dr. Priestley; but these suffered from the suspicious orthodoxy of their colleagues headed by the master. The poet Coleridge, whose late writings did so much to foster the romantic and High Church movement, was a Jesus man; and in the days of the beginning of Church restoration the High Church fellows of Jesus inaugurated the movement in Cambridge by the restoration of the beautiful college chapel—of these several were alive when I was admitted as a fellow.

From the day I was admitted I was entrusted with the entire work of theological education; but the ground had been long prepared by my predecessors, and by the fact that many of the scholarships on an ancient foundation were restricted to sons and orphans of clergymen of the Church of England. This naturally provided me with men likely to take orders; and, shortly after my arrival Lord Justice Kay gave a liberal benefaction to encourage post-graduate study for students who had taken high honours and were intending to enter the ministry of the Church of England. Thus for many years I had to educate men who were to become clergymen directly they passed out of my hands. The college had also a considerable connection with some nonconformist schools, and some of my best pupils were preparing for the Wesleyan, Baptist and other ministries. A very distinguished young scholar of mine was an orthodox

Jew, who is now minister of a London synagogue. By a happy coincidence, for I take no credit to myself, not a single candidate for the ministry, Anglican or otherwise, who took honours in theology from my college, changed his mind as to his vocation.

In 1897 I became examining chaplain to Dr. Glyn, Bishop of Peterborough, whose diocese included Leicester, Northampton and a number of smaller manufacturing towns. Together the bishop and I devised a plan for training for the ministry young men who could not otherwise have afforded to enter upon it. We decided to send the majority to Oxford or Cambridge, mostly to the last named university, as they could be under my supervision. Many of these with very inadequate school education, having been in business for several years, obtained high honours. One, now at the front, left school for an office at the age of thirteen, began to learn Greek and Latin at eighteen, and graduated with the highest distinction in history and theology. I had thus the opportunity of supervising the studies of men who had not been educated for the clerical office under normal conditions.

In the course of my work I have been led to make a special investigation into the education of the clergy throughout England. I have had many intimate friends at the Universities of Oxford and Durham, and have been constantly at both; and, for three years, I examined for the final B.D. at London University. I have visited and been hospitably entertained at many of the clergy schools and seminaries, including the great Methodist College of Richmond, Surrey, which numbers two of my pupils among its professors. In consequence I think I may claim to have a fairly wide experience so far as England is concerned.

As regards America I must naturally be more diffident. Arriving in March 1916 with the object of delivering the Lowell Lectures at Boston on a literary subject, I

found myself, to my great surprise, chosen as a professor in the Union Theological Seminary, and after spending six months in touch with the Divinity School at Harvard I commenced my duties in New York. I soon found that I had almost the same work to do as I had done at Cambridge, namely, to see that my pupils grasped certain facts and were taught to think for themselves and to draw their own inferences.

Neither in Cambridge nor in New York have I detected much *odium theologicum* among candidates for the ministry. Certainly strong friendships are formed between men of different communions, and the *esprit de corps* between members of an institution is a most powerful incentive to unity. In England, where the rivalry between Church and Dissent is far more bitter than in America, I am certain that the High Church incumbent would have something in common with the pastor of Ebenezer by both having been at the same college, which they could not share with anyone not possessing a similar advantage. The very disputes they used to have as young men about their religious views would be common memories to keep alive their regard for one another.

The present system of numerous small denominational seminaries is, I am persuaded, the most provocative of devices to keep the Churches apart. Men are carefully instructed in the peculiar doctrines of one particular body and those of others are generally misrepresented. They have no opportunity of learning why other men are Presbyterians or Methodists or Episcopalians, or for what these bodies are striving. They do not have the chance of discussing questions with men who differ from them and the result is that they go into the ministry with all the narrowness of ignorance. One step in the right direction has been taken by placing seminaries in or near universities. This has been done both in England and America; but with a few honourable exceptions I cannot think that the experiment has been

fairly tried. From what I can judge in England the tendency has been to make clerical colleges in the universities conform too much with those elsewhere. When the Cambridge Clergy School was founded by the inspiration of Dr. Westcott as Regius Professor, his ideal was that of a statesman and a scholar. He placed it under the charge of Dr. Chase, now Bishop of Ely, whose reputation as a theologian was already being made. There was no college building, as men were expected to live in their own colleges, attend their own chapels and halls, mix with other men and enjoy certain devotional privileges in connection with the school. They were to be scholars rather than seminarists and to avoid party distinctions. In process of time a building was erected for the accommodation of scholars, and soon placed under Dr. Knight, now Bishop of Gibraltar. True to the Westcott tradition, Dr. Knight devised a scheme of associates in order to keep in touch with what now may be called the secular students. Under his successor the school was conducted on almost the same lines as one in a cathedral city; and there was a marked tendency to make the students attend the curriculum of the institution, and to separate themselves from university life. Ridley Hall, which is distinctly evangelical, adopted, in my opinion, a wiser policy and more distinctly encouraged its students to read for university examinations. The Roman Catholic Hostel, St. Edmund's, seems to have encouraged its men to take their part in the secular studies, especially classics and history; but I do not think its governing body realized the importance of retaining principals who were in touch with the university. Two at least certainly ought to have been retained at almost any cost; but were allowed to go. The two non-conforming colleges, Cheshunt and Westminster, had on their staffs men who would have been ornaments to any university; for men like Skinner, Whitehouse, Oman, Gibb and others might have supple-

mented the Anglican staff of Cambridge professors to its great advantage.

Here, however, we come to the weak spot in the settlement of seminaries in universities both in England and America. None of the Churches seem to realize that, whereas instruction in their own respective tenets ought to be given by men of their own communion, most of the subjects a clergyman ought to be taught are in the strictest sense undenominational. The knowledge of Hebrew and the kindred languages belongs to no sect or party, and the qualification of those who teach them should not be sectarian. The Old and New Testaments belong to no single body of Christians; but are the property of the world. The study of comparative religion ought to be above all things scientific. Why, therefore, should a seminary planted in a university, where these subjects are professed by men generally of world wide reputation, appoint professors at great expense to teach them? To do so to add to the teaching power of the university is a merit; but what is to be said to seminaries who actually discourage their students from attending the classes of professors of the highest eminence, and almost force them to go to inferior men whom they have chosen? I would even include church history in this category, for as an Anglican I would much rather send my pupils to a heretic who adopted a scholarly method to prove that in the New Testament bishops and presbyters were identical than to hear a slipshod and inaccurate argument in favour of the eternal dignity of the bishop's office. For the real value of a teacher, to my mind, lies in his method and not in his conclusions; and statements made without authority and arguments advanced without logic do more harm when used in the cause of truth than anything else. My contention is that all subjects of general, as opposed to purely ecclesiastical interests, ought to be taught by universities and in a university spirit, rather than in seminaries.

One difficulty I have always found is in the very natural impatience of young men, burning to carry their message to mankind, to learn the technique of their future profession rather than to apply themselves to the necessary drudgery of study. In the words, but not in the sense of Luther, I have implored young men to beware of "good works" during the too brief period they have to devote to theological study. I have often noticed that promising men, in their laudable eagerness to benefit the world by "good works" before the time, have signally failed in doing really good work. The Church is in grievous danger of having a ministry whose supposed practical efficiency has been purchased at the expense of remaining ignorant and slovenly in mind. I am not one of those who think that all clergy should be professed theologians; but I am persuaded that they should be educated men. Now I take an educated man to be one who has mastered one or more subjects pretty thoroughly. The reason the classics and mathematical studies were so successful was that they put men through a severe mental discipline, and taught them the principles of accurate expression and clear thought. If I found a youth who was desirous of entering the ministry, and anxious to devote himself at a seminary exclusively to the practical side, and he could convince me that he had really attained a certain mastery of any subject, literary, scientific or linguistic, I should be inclined to allow him to dispense in a measure with theology proper; because I could feel certain that, when the time came, he would not be satisfied with a superficial knowledge of any subject, and, at least, would not be likely to pretend to speak with authority on what he did not know. At any rate such a man would have learned what really knowing anything means, and, therefore, he could be trusted. The man I really suspect is one who desires to devote himself to the study of homiletics in order that he may learn how to preach before he

has anything to preach about; or, who wishes to become a social worker without going through the drudgery of mastering the fundamental principles of political economy. The danger of our time seems to me to be flatulent eloquence and misguided zeal; and most of our failures religiously and socially are due to the disposition to talk for the sake of talking, and to act before understanding the problems we are trying to grapple. But the reason for laying so much stress on a purely theological education is this:—the Christian world needs as perhaps it has never done, except in the second, fourth and sixteenth centuries, a systemization of its theology. A vast amount of work has been done in the last hundred years but it is incomplete and inchoate. The war has ended an age and a new one is dawning; and religion needs above all things pioneers. I am not one of those who desire in any way to disparage the great contributions Germany has made to theology; nor would it be becoming to me to do so, considering how much American scholarship owes to German teachers. But I am persuaded that the English speaking world has a function of its own to discharge in shaping the religious thought of the future. Nor must we forget that the war has levied a heavy toll not only in lives but in the energy of European scholars. For years England, France, Italy and Germany, those homes of learning and the arts, will have little heart or leisure for the sedentary work of study. The next generation and perhaps generations, will be occupied in restoring what the past three years have destroyed, and America may be the one home where the leisure necessary for true learning and research is available. The question is whether its theologians can rise to the occasion. Hitherto, at least in recent years, the best professors have owed their main inspiration to their studies in German universities. Some time will certainly have to elapse before they can hope to do so again. Probably it will be easier for Amer-

ican theologians to come sooner into touch with those of England and her allies. This will have its advantage, for assuredly, we in England have something to teach as well as to learn. France and the Latin races have graces all their own, and a power of presentation of facts and ideas denied to many of us of Teutonic stock. England, on the other hand, has a tradition of scholarship, which lives in some of the older universities here, but has not, I venture to think, sufficiently permeated the whole educational system. Scotland has, in addition, a more widely diffused love of learning than most nations, and universities planned on broader lines than the older English institutions.

But, though it is most desirable that the best instruction shall be sought wherever it can be obtained, America will have to depend greatly on her own resources for the next few years. She will have to train a body of native theologians, capable of teaching her own students and of attracting scholars from Europe; and it is to be hoped that this work will be seriously undertaken alike in the Universities and in the seminaries of the country. We have sufficient data to demonstrate that this is by no means impossible. America has produced theologians of the first rank. There are some still living, whom it would be invidious to name, capable of adorning any university in the world; but the question is, can this be done at home under existing conditions? The difficulty seems to lie less in lack of material, than in the prevalent ideal of clerical requirements. The need of a learned ministry is less felt now than at any other period; for there is abroad in almost all churches a positive suspicion of a really learned minister. If he is not regarded as at least potentially heretical, he is pretty sure to be condemned as unpractical, the fact being that everything is being sacrificed to immediate results. But in the case of Christianity as elsewhere the real demand is for the highly educated, the trained thinkers to direct the

workers. Whilst, therefore, no pains should be spared to make our candidates thoroughly efficient in the practical work of the ministry, we cannot afford to neglect the scholarly side. Even if, as some aver, in the Protestant Churches of Germany the tendency has been towards excessive exaltation of the professorial element, this has assuredly not been the case in England nor, as I suspect, in America. To take the English episcopate in the early eighties and compare it with that of the present. In the small Upper House of Convocation of the Northern Province were Thompson of York, Lightfoot of Durham, Harvey Goodwin of Carlisle, Stubbs of Chester, Fraser of Manchester and Ryle of Liverpool. In the Province of Canterbury were Tait the Archbishop, Harold Browne of Winchester, Atlay of Hereford, Ellicott of Gloucester, and Bristol, Lord Arthur Hervey of Bath and Wells, Temple of Exeter, Benson of Truro, Ollivant of Llandaff. Every one of these men had taken brilliant academic honours and many had contributed to the theological learning of the day; Magee of Peterborough, in the pulpit and in the House of Lords, was prominent as an orator. With a few honourable exceptions, there are at present hardly any occupants of the episcopal bench who are capable of really joining in a discussion, in which, say, twenty picked theologians of England and America, were taking part. It is hardly too much to fear that in a few years the English episcopate will count for nothing in the educated world.[1]

[1]I have gathered the following statistics from Crockford's *Clerical Directory* about the Diocesan Bishops of England and Wales. They number forty. Of these thirteen were elected fellows of colleges in Oxford and Cambridge; eight others took a first class in Moderations, Triposes and Honour schools; seven obtained second class honours; eleven apparently took pass degrees; and one was ill at the time of his examination for honours at Cambridge.

As to their published works: sixteen do not acknowledge that they have printed anything; fifteen are credited with devotional works, sermons and charges. Nine (Drs. Talbot, Chase, Gibson, Hicks, Gore, Harmer, Moule, Wild and Drury) have published books on theological subjects which merit the attention of serious

Of course the appointments to the Anglican sees are in the hands of the government; but the authorities are disposed to consult the wishes of influential churchmen, and the men nominated are such as we might expect would be chosen by ordinary electoral bodies; and perhaps a trifle better than these would select. It must not, however, be forgotten that the disestablished Church of Ireland has as one of its archbishops, Dr. Bernard of Dublin, one of the first theologians in the Anglican communion.

The episcopal selections in England are symptomatic of one of the heresies of the age—the belief that scholarly, scientific and intellectual gifts are incompatible with administrative ability. Not that Tait, once tutor of Baliol, Oxford, failed in this respect; and I have been told that, though the lay peers do not as a rule particularly respect the opinion of their spiritual colleagues, no one had more influence in the Lords. His successor, Benson, made the see of Truro; Lightfoot's work at Durham was a veritable making of dry bones live; and when, at his death, Westcott, the most unintelligible of mystics, took his place, he astonished the world by settling one of the most formidable of miners' strikes. This preference of mediocrity may extend to other churches beside the Anglican; but whatever may be the sentiment of the day, I firmly believe that unless the Church Universal has its doctors as well as its evangelists, pastors, helps and governments, it cannot hold

scholars. The Archbishop of Canterbury's *Life of Archbishop Tait* is an admirable ecclesiastical biography. Not one, so far as I know, is a Fellow of the British Academy. Had that body existed in the eighties, it would not have been respectable, if it had not included Lightfoot and Stubbs; and probably it would have welcomed at least four other of the bishops. At present it has recognized the Anglican clergy in Drs. Driver, Swete, Sanday, Rashdall, Cunningham and Charles, and Anglican theology in Professor Burkitt and Mr. C. H. Turner. It is but just to say that some of the Bishops' academic distinctions make one regret that they have not produced the scholarly work which they were fully competent to give to the world.

its own in the world we live in. An educated world requires an educated clergy and if it fails to get one, it will end by dispensing with clergymen altogether. The problem is to send forth not only well-trained religious workers but also men taught to think accurately and scientifically.

To do this, in the first place, as has been indicated, the teaching of the sources of our religion, the Scriptures and the Christian records, must be given academically and not in a spirit of sectarian partiality. This all universities should be encouraged to do. Even of more importance is it that students should be impressed with the absolute necessity of thoroughness. They often labour under the disadvantage of having no practical knowledge of any ancient language when they begin their study of theology, and are consequently debarred from the original authorities. Here is a really difficult problem. Are we right, under the present circumstances, in demanding of our candidates for the ministry a smattering, for it cannot be more, of Latin, Greek and Hebrew? It is very different from the time when Latin and Greek were taught as a matter of course in the schools, and a certain power of reading French and German was not considered indispensable. As things are we have to look them in the face and consider what it is desirable to teach the average man. I believe that every theological student should be encouraged to learn one ancient language fairly thoroughly and that at every centre, whether it be seminary or university, there should be professors of Greek and Latin and Hebrew, appointed to teach not exegesis but grammar in the wider sense of the word. As an examiner I have found that as a rule men did far better in Biblical Hebrew than in the Greek of the New Testament because they had to be taught Hebrew as an entirely new language, whereas it was assumed that they knew some Greek. Except in the case of men who had given evidence of a real

mastery of another subject, I would keep every student thus at work till he could satisfy the authorities that he had a useful, if not profound, knowledge of the language he selected. When he had done this he might be allowed a wide discretion as to what he studied—homiletics, field work, religious education and the like. This insistence upon one language only would be beneficial to the student and no disadvantage to those who had really scholarly instincts, as the latter would be certain to extend their studies; and the thoroughness of the preparation they had received would enable them to master what they required with comparative ease.

Up to a certain point the larger the institutions at which our future clergy are trained the better, the great desideratum being to encourage width of sympathy and experience of all sorts of men. Whilst, therefore, I advocate the necessity of providing the Church with trained scholars, it would be a mistake to divide the practical and scholarly training of ministers into separate compartments. It is a great disadvantage to a theological professor to be unversed in the work of a clergyman; for, as a very celebrated theologian once remarked to me, when I told him how much some men with little scholarship enjoyed his lectures, "You see, I've had many years' parochial experience." It is only by educating men intending to be professors under the same roof as our future ministers, that we can maintain a salutary sympathy between them. To turn out a scholarly-minded pastorate and pastorally-minded professors ought to be the ideal of every seminary and university with a theological faculty. But, I confess, I have a prejudice in favour of an honour and pass school in our educational system, in order that able men, who desire to specialize, should be left as far as possible free to pursue their own studies and to consult such professors as they think can best assist them.

As the object of this article is to indicate how far re-

union of Christians may be brought about by education, it has been necessary to lay especial stress on the intellectual aspect. The men among whom the true principle of unity exists are genuine scholars. Whatever prejudices one may have in favour of certain doctrines, views of government, even principles of morality, one has to give attention to the written or spoken opinions of opponents, provided they are backed by real knowledge. A scholar's library cannot exclude the books of other scholars of whose opinions he disapproves. As I study the articles on sacraments and liturgies in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* I am struck by the way in which Anglican students in those fields are referred to as authorities. Fortescue can no more ignore Brightman and Warren, than they can dispense with the results of his investigations; for knowledge is absolutely unsectarian. A Romanist or Protestant scholar can only attack the other when guilty of issuing garbled quotations, maintaining opinions based on inadequate evidence and similar offences against the truth. Even amid all the bitterness engendered by this world-wide war scholarship has to remain international. It is, in fact, one of the few things which rise superior to all the unnatural divisions dividing the human race. We may hate a man to the point of desiring his life, but not to the extent of saying that he is wrong when we know him to be right.

As I believe nineteen twentieths of the difficulty of bringing Christians together is due to ignorance, the best remedy is better education in theology given in common to men of various Churches. An experiment is being made in America on a considerable scale in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. Founded in 1837 by Liberal Presbyterians it has now theological students of no less than twenty-four denominations, admitted without any religious tests whatever, and given instruction entirely without fee. Though the doctrines and system of the Presbyterian Church are by charter taught

in the Seminary to those who desire to learn them, the professors are not obliged to belong to any particular Church or in any way restricted in their opinions. At the same time any professor in the faculty may freely teach the tenets of the Church to which he belongs and facilities are given him to use the beautiful chapel of the Seminary. For this purpose the students are given instruction in almost every branch of a clergyman's duty. Not only are there professors in almost every aspect of Theology, properly so called, but Religious Instruction, Missions, Field Work, Church Music, etc. have their separate departments. The difficult art of pulpit oratory is represented by four professors, all celebrated preachers, nor is the composition of sermons and elocution neglected. Daily services in the chapel with addresses, a sermon on Sundays by a special preacher and religious conferences are arranged to minister to the spiritual wants of the inmates. Not a few ordained clergy leave their parishes for a time to seek leisure for study as graduate students in the Seminary.

Though eighty years have elapsed since this foundation was planned on these generous lines, it still remains to be proved whether it will perform the important task allotted to it. It has already numbered among its Presidents, Professors and Alumni scholars of world-wide reputation. Its interchange of instruction with Columbia University, in the midst of which the Seminary stands, gives unrivalled opportunities both of expansion and influence; and it has the possibility of becoming one of the greatest centres of theological study in the world. It may even be one of the great means of establishing a system which may bring Christians together as they have not been for centuries. Its future depends much upon itself and much also on the attitude of the Churches. If it stands firm to the maintenance of a free and unfettered study of theology as a science, if it resolutely refuses to be dictated to by the voices of ignorant piety

and shortsighted expediency, if it refuses to sacrifice thoroughness and sound scholarship to the production of results of superficial efficiency, it will have at least proved true to the principles on which its foundations were laid. But there is more than negative work to be undertaken. Before Union and the great Schools of Theology in America lies the task of placing the study on a sound basis. The young men have to be encouraged to productive work, some by writing, some by preaching, some as teachers. The world needs a constructive theology combined with an intelligent system of ethics, personal as well as social. Nothing permanent can be done in this direction without enlisting and training the best intellect of this and other countries. Nothing but the very best ought to satisfy in the selection of professors and lecturers; no effort should be spared to secure and retain men of promise; and, though the watchword in religion is tolerance, as regards second-rate unscholarly work none should be displayed.

But if Union Seminary has its task—and a most ambitious one it surely is—the Churches have their part to perform. They have some of them to depart from an attitude of ungenerous suspicion. At least they should acknowledge that here they see an attempt being made to solve difficulties which they have not hitherto treated with success. Far more important even than reunion is the problem of retaining the boys and girls as they grow up. These have certainly very little sympathy with the doctrines taught in most Churches. As adolescence and impecuniosity generally accompany each other, we ministers are apt to defer to the generation who support us, and then to complain that the young people will not come to church. If we want to retain them it can only be by the ministry of those who have intelligently faced the problems, the solution of which the rising generation have been hitherto groping after, and can plainly tell the conclusions to which thought and

study have brought them. This can only be done by men who have been liberally trained in theology. We are often in despair at the comparative failure of Christian missions especially among the more intelligent of the non-Christian world. Is not this want of success partly due to the fact that the Churches are offering a form of Christianity which appealed to congregations of sixty years ago but has little or no meaning to educated folk today?

Above all we are dismayed at our unhappy divisions. For this, at least, Union is attempting to provide a remedy. Here are some two hundred students, gathered from every State in America and from Canada, China, and Japan, belonging to many religious denominations representing every shade of opinion, living together as a happy family, learning to study the Scriptures, to investigate Christian history, to preach, to instruct the young, to minister to the sick, to visit the afflicted, from the same teachers. Are such men likely to go into the world and find it impossible to tolerate one another as ministers in different Churches? Will they be of the class which desire others to unite with them by subjecting themselves to their peculiar views? Such an institution with such aims should not come to the Churches with pleas for toleration and encouragement; but rather with exhortations to join in its work and to follow its example. By all means let every Church demand that those who wish to become its ministers should thoroughly understand its doctrines, its polity and what it stands for; but let them combine in giving their young men a common education in the subjects which are of common interest to all. Let them mix together, work together, pray together, discuss together, and instead of reunion being an interesting topic for a Church conference, it will come silently and perhaps unsuspectedly, not by arrangement and compromise, but naturally and spontaneously.

The Righteousness of the Unity of Christians

By Peter Ainslie, D.D., LL.D.
President of the "Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity."

Jesus Christ is the greatest fact in history. All nations have had their exalted characters, as all countries have their mountain ranges, but towering above the highest and yet a part of them all is Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God and our Lord and Saviour. The beauty and charm of His Divine personality have lifted nation after nation out of the depths of degradation and the slough of unfaith, until to-day there is a universal lift felt among all the nations of the earth.

We care as little about men's theories of this Divine personality as we do about their theories of the sun, which, irrespective of men's opinions of it, has been lighting up the universe with its golden light from the undated ages of the past. It is so with Christ, the Illuminator of the moral and spiritual universe, Whose Divine purpose can no more be checked or changed by human opinions than one of us could climb to the sun and blow out its blazing light with our feeble breath!

Christianity started neither from theological ideas nor from ethical principles, but from the person of Jesus Christ. He is the issue of these times above all other issues. To Him has been committed the conquest of this world until God shall become all in all. The material achievements of genius, which in this day appear to hold priority over spiritual matters, are absolutely

secondary to the purposes of God's programme in Christ. From the fact of Christ, His Church was established on the Day of Pentecost, and its purpose is to redeem mankind from sin and train the race into the holiness of God. It is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone," and it was He Who affirmed that "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." Its history marks the beginning of the ministry of the Holy Spirit on earth, just as the birth in the Bethlehem manger marked the beginning of the earthly life of our Lord. Jesus promised that the Comforter, Whom He called at one time "the Spirit of Truth" and at another time "the Holy Spirit," would come and would remain with His disciples, convicting the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment, and taking up His residence in the bodies of believers, He would sanctify them by His holy power, so that the apostle, writing to the Thessalonians, said: "Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and in much assurance." The believers became mighty in power and rejoiced under suffering. They were benevolent in their practises towards the poor and sought to maintain brotherhood with all those who had come in fellowship with Christ. It was indeed a new life. When they were scattered abroad by persecution they went everywhere preaching, making Jesus Christ known to all in obedience to the commission that they held from Him.

It was a magnificent programme, throbbing with Divine life, but the great forces of evil met within the bosom of the Church for the struggle of supremacy, as years before they had met in the bosom of Jesus when He was tempted in the wilderness. In His fidelity to the Father He cut His way to conquest then, and the hope of the Church lay in the pathway that had been marked by its Head. The Church, however, reeled to and fro in her struggle and her decks were swept and her

riggings torn as of ships in a storm. Those were dark days and it sometimes looked as though the madness of human passion would put out all light and drive the ship to total wreckage, but living faith in the living Christ opened the path to victory. God had not left Himself without witnesses, but great struggles marked the path of the Church. Hatred among disciples of Jesus became as marked as love among the first disciples. Definitions sprung into prominence and tests of orthodoxy over the divinely given badge of Christian discipleship, which had been committed to the first disciples by Jesus Himself. Clusters of great names stand before us. Some wore the garbs of priests and others the plain garments of reformers. These were noble souls. Whether they wore the name of Roman Catholics or Reformers, they were princes in the House of God, before whose memories we stand with unsandaled feet—names like Bernard, Savonarola, Francis, Wyclif, Hus, Loyola, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Wesley and Campbell. They led from light to light, until out of the clouds of misunderstanding a new spirit appeared to be taking control of the hearts of men and the Church began reading afresh our Lord's declaration when He said, "they shall become one flock, one Shepherd." This is simply an axiomatic conclusion to which many in the various communions, especially on the foreign fields, are looking and through the murky distance are seeing the rise of great movements making towards the union of the Church of God.

The unity of Christians is the righteousness of Christ. It is the spirit and genius of His religion. The Apostle Paul condemned in unmistakable terms the threatened division in the Corinthian church, and to the Ephesians he wrote, "Giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in

all." Back of all this stands the prayer of Jesus: "Holy Father, keep them in Thy name, which Thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are . . . neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word, that they may all be one; even as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that Thou didst send me." There can be but one interpretation to this and that is that Christianity cannot be a mere humanitarian fraternity, such as that between brothers of the same fathers and mothers, but it is a oneness between believers like that between God and Jesus and without that triumph Christianity cannot reach the whole world, so that Christian union is no fancy of a few individuals. It is one of the essentials in Christ's conquest of the world.

Union is the law of the physical universe. Separation is the other name for death, while coöperation is the other name for life. Ruskin has shown us in his "Ethics of the Dust" the fatality of the struggle of competition between clay, sand and soot, competing for place and squeezing out one another, but let the elements gather together, like to like, so that the atoms get into close relationship, and the clay, following the instinct of unity, becomes white and clear and hard, so that it gathers out of the light the loveliest blue rays and we call it a sapphire. The sand, following the same instinct of unity, becomes white, then clear and hard, and arranges itself in parallel lines, which have the power of reflecting the blue, green, purple and red rays in the greatest beauty in which they can be seen through any hard material substance, and we call it an opal. The soot sets to work under the same law and it becomes clear and then the hardest thing in the world, and has the power of reflecting all the rays of the sun at once, in the vividest blaze that anything can shoot, and we call it a diamond. As out of the slime these jewels are made by following

the instinct of unity, so out of our imperfect humanity by following the law of love as revealed in Christ we can be made into His likeness.

The various communions have done well. They have done their best, but it is absolutely impossible for any communion in Christendom to either conquer the world or to produce the best type of Christianity that the world is capable of producing. It is contrary to the laws of nature and religion. Comity must succeed rivalry, coöperation must succeed competition, and love must be the distinctive peculiarity of Christianity before either the final move is made for the world conquest or the best flower of Christian faith is produced on earth. Neither Greek Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism nor Protestantism can last as they are now. All of these divisions have in themselves the prophecy of death, but love and help and government and freedom and kindness are as immortal as God. For one communion to join another, or for a dozen communions to federate together, is not the solution of this problem. Such federations help. Not until we who believe in Jesus are willing to be lifted out of the realm of formal Christianity and make our abiding in the activities of vital Christianity, where faith in Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of God and love for all mankind become the dominating principles of life, will the world be convinced that Jesus is the Christ.

The union of believers is common sense. They believe in the same God, the same Christ, the same Holy Spirit; they read the same Bible and hold sacred the same day and urge the same holiness. Then how absurd to mar this common faith and common service by separating the forces into unsympathetic communions and practising an unbrotherliness that the whole world sees from Hongkong and Calcutta to London and New York. Five communions enter a little town with a thousand people and work independently of each other and frequently are more hostile against each other than

against the works of iniquity. Five hundred ministers are working in a city of half a million people, and largely the only coöperation is that between those who bear the same denominational name, and each of these groups is working as though there were no other workers in town, and sometimes overlapping each other's fields as freely as though the others were congregations of pagans. It is not simply an extravagant use of energy and money, but it is a powerful assault upon one of the fundamental principles of Christianity, which is the brotherhood of believers. Of all the instances of business sagacity, denominational Christendom presents to-day the most ridiculous programme of any institution upon the face of the earth, so that it may well be said, "The sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light."

Some believe that their communion will swallow up all other communions and so are contented with this state of affairs, urging the continuance of the separation of brethren because of this vain and sectarian hope. We must be patient, however. It must not be forgotten that such a position is as unreasonable as to advocate the practising of the opposites of the ten commandments, for division in the House of God is immorality. The way to a united Christendom is clearing up. Thousands in all communions are anxiously desiring it, and out of the consciousness of its necessity no one communion may lead us, lest that communion fall by its pride, but Christ in various communions shall be the Leader of us all.

Forms and ceremonies are not religion, but belong in the realm of formal Christianity and are governed frequently by tastes and traditions and have no more right to separate brethren than the choice of food on the table has to break up the peace of a family. Theologies are not religion, for they change with the centuries in their attempt to explain religion, and have no more right to separate brethren than theories of commerce have to break

up human friendship. One argues that baptism is the great barrier to a united Christendom, but this is not true, for the various families of immersionists are no closer together than the various families of pedobaptists. Another contends that the historic episcopate is the chief barrier, but this is not true, for a distinguished prelate of that communion, the late bishop of Albany, said, "Because we are convinced of the validity of our orders in the apostolic line, we are not called upon to doubt or to deny the validity, whatever may be the irregularity, of another sort of ordination. If validity means anything, it means power to accomplish an end; and with the abundant results of such ministries, which are quite apart and separate from our own, it seems to me that only a blind man or a maniac can question their validity."

The solution lies not in our theories nor in our compromises, but in such a return to the beliefs and practises of the New Testament Church that faith in Jesus and love among believers will come as refreshing as a warm April day after the damp, cold winds of March. "This is His commandment, that we should believe in the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another." The world's hope is grounded in this and it will come as surely as the tides come in the sea or the stars come in the sky.

The New Age and the Church

By Horace M. DuBose, D.D.,
Editor of the Methodist Review.

The present world war is to bring abundant and gigantic political changes and readjustments; but it is to find an even larger expression in ideals. Belligerents and neutrals alike are saved from despair by the belief that the usufruct of blood and material sacrifice is not to be a handful of diplomatic chaff in altered but unamended international relations, but the fine wheat of a righteous harvest which is to supply the bread of a lasting peace. Action shapes itself to this faith. Democracy rises up to gird itself and publish decree, even while the verdict of history is preparing. Social philosophy sees the widening of its field in every direction. Science and industry accept beforehand the task of more than repairing the material wastes of war, while commerce reads its future in the language of romance. But the marvel of realization is to be exhibited in the new consciousness, and in the new answer to law.

The centuries of the Old Testament canon represent mankind in the processes of discovering the commandment, while those of the New Testament show men seeking the power to keep that commandment. But nations and men alike come into this power through penitence. This is a fact which comes of both necessity and law; and penitence, alas, can come only of chastisement, which ministers a sense of sin and its penalties. Bitter indeed is that chastisement out of which comes no penitence; and worse than profitless is that penitence which does not leave the penitent in possession of a larger mea-

sure of purpose and power. The world is conscious of a vast account of sin recorded against it; the world has bowed its back to the scourge, recognizing, tragically invoking, the law which gives measure for measure. It is through this abnegation and loss of all things that the world hopes for restitution and the guarantee of peace and righteousness. It is a species of prophecy which has the advantage of accumulated precedent. Men who have eliminated chiliastic tenets from their creeds yet lay store by an age whose birth signs are marked by fire and sacrifice. It is not only the larger hope, but it is the desperate alternative of men's thoughts, that the world war is to issue in a world nationalism, a drawing together of peoples, not for political and commercial advantage, but for the preservation of the peace of mankind, a term which describes alike the universal good and the universal destiny. Under this *rapprochement* there should be, and no doubt will be, such a spirit and fact of international unity as has not before been realized in history. This unity must be invoked upon lines well attested by experience, and must correlate every force which has contributed, or can contribute, to the larger good of humanity. It is not too much to say—it is never too much to say—that religion represents the first and the last of these forces. Religion should be the solvent of all those difficulties which the sword has been too often employed to settle. Certainly, religion as expressed in the church should be brought to bear instantly and vitally upon the aftermath of war. The age of this aftermath is nearly enough at hand to disclose an outline of its needs, which needs must offer to the church a renewal of its ancient commission to teach and disciple the nations.

This puts us fairly abreast of the question being asked in a thousand forms today: "What part is the church to have in the work of reconstruction which is to come after the war?" The general judgment is that larger responsibilities are to fall to the church in this new world task;

but it has become the fashion in some quarters to doubt and decry the ability of organized religion to realize on its own doctrines of ministry and service. The charge is broadly made that the churches are too much occupied with their own differences and the task of keeping intact their own organizations to get out of themselves into the century light of a world programme. Much of this results from a misinterpretation of the church's mission and the temporal limitations that grow out of this mission. Manifestly, the church as an organization, or considered as a series of related organizations, can no more go into world politics than it can go into the politics of city or province. It cannot dictate international policies, name the ministers of state, nor influence the election of diets; but it can so preach its doctrines, so order its inner and outer relations, and so witness to the truth, as to inspire the manhood of the world to accomplish in administrations, diplomacies, and social compacts the largest ends of wisdom and righteousness. From the several vantages from which organized religion might, and should, advance to a world ministry and influence, I have selected for this discussion, the question of church unity, because it is of prime importance as a means, and because it is already a topic of conversation uppermost in the world of Christian thought.

In discussing the relation of church unity to the problems of the world after the war, I shall consider both the question of church union and religious solidarity. For while these have aspects quite apart from each other in practical realization, they are yet integrants of a whole. Certainly, solidarity is the basis of union, and union is only solidarity brought to its logical end. Any assumption that the church can go to the task of solving the now emerging problems of mankind only on the basis of union, would be to confess a creed of temporal despair. Church union is far from being impossible, and is historically nearer a realization than at any former

time, unless indeed the times of the remote beginnings of Christianity be considered. Even the elemental differences of those earlier times were prophetic of the historic cleavages of modern centuries. Truth carries always the element of ferment, and until the goal of perfection is reached, this ferment will continue to be repellant and separative. But many of these processes having wrought their ends, a large measure of Christian unity is due to emerge. Within certain very comprehensive limits it is a comparatively early probability; yet that there is possible a union of such extent and significance as to constitute a wholly new or even phenomenally enlarged force in the life of the near future, is not thinkable. General church union in this century would be a paradox of history, a moral miracle. However, there are those who include miracles in their creed. And where could the application of the tenet of the miraculous better begin than at "the house of God"? In this faith, I put myself amongst those who not only pray for, but work for, the realization of what must be the ultimate of Christian unity in the restitution of all things to their divinely appointed relationships. But the present demand is for a unity attained, and for the uses of that unity in an urgent, practical necessity, and not for the ultimate or prophetic fruits of unity. It is not something to placate theological differences and allure to slow moving ecclesiastical moots, but something to be used as an immediate reconstructive and remedial agency in rehabilitating both religion and civilization, for that both have suffered is a fact as plain as it is sad. In view of all this, it appears proper to consider the question of union and solidarity as separate propositions, to see how nearly they are related and to what extent each may be invoked in the prosecution of the new task.

But before entering upon a formal discussion, it is necessary to call attention to the fact that these war-created problems do not constitute for the church a real-

ly new task, but rather an enlarged one, enlarged beyond any experience of the past. Instead of one man by the Jericho roadside, robbed, bleeding and left to die, it is a world full of bruised, robbed and dying humanity which calls to the church for the exercise of its Good Samaritan ministries. Instead of a single Gadarene, demon possessed, and coming out of the tombs, it is concatenated nations in despair and literally living amongst the tombs of their dead and the ashes of their former glory that appeal to the divine word of power. The task and the remedy are both old, and the parable and the miracle apply. The cause of all is sin and more sin, and the fruits of both; the remedy is simple enough, yet the manner of making it effective is the church's sorest difficulty. To minister and to teach describe the church's large address to this and to all other tasks of human need. More gospel; a multiplication of human-like and adaptable ministries; a greater emphasis upon the Bible as the light and guide of mankind; yet higher ethical realizations immediately to be sought after; a surer spiritual testimony; and all these concreted into a world fellowship of Christians is the answer which we seek to the question before us. Our study of the aspects of union and solidarity should indicate where the largest practicalities lie, and these should point to yet others, still more remote but desirable of realization.

Most Christians today desire church unity, and are seeking it within more or less broadly expanded lines, as also with a greater or less investment of assiduity and faith. This manifestation is symptomatic of the Christian spirit of the age, and is not uninfluenced by the prophetic needs of the times that lie beyond the years of war. Nothing is more certainly indicative of the abiding divinity of Christianity than this sensitiveness to world need. Christian men of all ways of thinking would have things different from what they are, only there is an overmind, composite and complex, which is made the

arbiter of individuals and of groups. The fulness of time is necessary to the climaxing of any aspect of truth or era or progress. The schools of unity are too diverse, and the issues which separate them are yet too sharp, to permit of the present making of a platform of complete agreement. Catholicity is the ideal and protest of all these schools; but even that term modifies many involved issues, or is itself modified by the elements involved. Roughly speaking, at least four schools of unity are distinguishable as contributing to the literature and activities of as many movements. First, there is the extreme hierarchical school which predicates faith and obedience of the acceptance of universal church authority expressed in a personal vice-gerency, which it is claimed was divinely established and has been historically maintained. This is scholastically described as the doctrine of the *catholica,* as against the more general Christian doctrine of catholicity. The second school is self-described in making appeal to the claim of a historic prelacy as the visible sign of unity; though in recent years this school has very considerably modified the conditions upon which it would be willing to treat for and foster general unity. The third school, not in the order of importance or numerical strength, but of sacramentarian insistency, invites unity upon the basis of compliance with a certain modal peculiarity of the ordinance of baptism, and, in some cases, with reference to a certain attitude toward the administration of the Eucharist. The fourth school, representing the majority of Protestant Christianity, lies, with its many diversities, between the second and the third schools. As very many members of the first and the second schools hold not a few similar views concerning ritual, prelacy and the *catholica;* so the second and the fourth schools have large agreeing contingents, particularly those who on the side of affinity and history mutually recognize the enduring value of those ideals which go under the name of Anglican; and those who

from the side of evangelical doctrine have a common interest in the traditions of the Reformation. It is to be noted, too, that the main elements of doctrinal catholicity characterize the beliefs of all these schools. Jesus Christ is divine, very God of very God; the atonement for sin is in his blood; the church is his body; faith is the condition of salvation; holiness is the measure of saint-hood; eternal life is the gift of God. This, in fact, is the most certain exhibit of solidarity and the surest hope of formal Christian unity.

A distinct tendency toward amalgamation has been started amongst various bodies of Christians on the basis of doctrinal likenesses or accommodations. Ritualistic and administrative differences have either been composed, or a new programme of polity has been resorted to, and a simplified formula, putting the catholic elements more and more forward, has been accepted. In recent years, as already noted, those who at first insisted upon the historic episcopate as an irreducible minimum have answered to the growing sense of catholicity by more than intimating that unity of faith is to take precedence of all other conditions. In addition to these tendencies, not a few other bodies, subdivided on minor questions, have been negotiating for a composure of differences and for reorganization, so that the churches of Christendom will go, in any case, to their new task with sentimental pledges of enhanced unity. Possibly by the time of the meeting of a world congress of peace, there will have taken place in the Dominion of Canada a union of practically all the Protestant bodies, while in the United States the consolidation of certain church entities now negotiating may result in the largest body of evangelical Protestants in the world.

The political world is, however, in much the same case as the church. It is now conceded that an enduring peace is dependent upon a world nationalism whose very constituents are yet to be determined. The hope is fair

that the accordant international elements will be found sufficiently strong to secure a compact for the support of peace. But who dreams now of the possibility of a parliament of man, or of a federation of the world, on a scale, or with power sufficient, to command or hold the world in a unity of view and action? Some do indeed dream of it; but the wise world-statesman is content to hope that the common sense and the sentimental accord of the powers will be able to bring the conditions of such a peace out of a maze of diplomacies as complex as the political and commercial systems of the nations themselves. Can the churches do more for their complexities of ritual, dogmas and polities? It is easy enough to say that the churches should set an example of unity for the nations. It is granted; he is the church's enemy who would maintain otherwise. But the objection does not alter the situation, nor does it in any wise help to the end in view. In fact, the conditions which make and foster national distinctions and differences are, in part, those which underlie religious diversity, and this every intelligent religionist must acknowledge. God who restricted nations to their own habitats, laid the necessity for religious differences at the base of their lives. He nevertheless caused to be prophesied a unity of nations, despite racial boundaries and differences; and of course this prophecy carries the hope of ultimate religious unity. In a large sense, world nationalism must make possible the way for religious catholicity. In other respects, and in larger, catholicity is to point the world to a certain and enduring nationalism. A state church is not the ideal of Christian worship and order, but a state built beside the church upon the catholic doctrines of the gospel and recognizing them in the same direct way as they are recognized by the church. The function of the church is to interpret the catholic doctrines in teaching and in spiritual instruction; the function of the state is to interpret these doctrines in an ethic, and in laws and

rules for the regulation and protection of society. Thus both the church and the state are to be Christian; thus they are both to form a part of the cycle of catholic ministries.

As an offset to the historical fact that no church organization has yet realized the ideal of universal extension, a cardinal aspect of the ideal of the *catholica*, it has been argued from Saint Augustine that the necessity of the *catholica* does not inhere in the fact of such universality, but in fitness and meetness for it. This begs the question. Where is the evidence of the fitness and meetness? The fact of non-extension weighs against the claim, and positive demonstration is wanting. But for all this, the idea of universality is certainly not unscriptural; it is not repugnant to reason, and is agreeable to the higher spiritual sense. This is the first general platform for those who desire and seek unity. Like faith in the final perfectability of the race, it is a creed to be held as a test of catholicity itself. It might be a wholesome exercise for all who insist on this universality to apply the test in a crucial way. It would bear equally upon members of all the schools.

I purposely do not enter here into a discussion of the question of the constitution and traditional organization of the church, nor of the various views held concerning orders and successions. The whole question of the *catholica*, with the details which it imposes, might very well come after the fact of catholicity has been realized. The experience of men in all ages is that, when great problems are on hand for solution, it is not best to take up the more crucial details for first consideration. The rule of elimination is the wise one. It is vital and pertinent to this whole question of unity that each of the schools has conceived of the church as the pillar and ground of the truth, the body of Him that filleth all in all, and as carrying in its message the hope and means of the world's salvation. Here is at least the opportu-

nity of seeing the church as the medium through which the consciousness and power of the divine life are to be communicated to men in all their relations and activities, whether these be designated as secular or religious. Thus the unity of the church, the realization of catholicity, is to describe the rising of mankind to a condition of religious, social and intellectual enlargement that involves at least a sure beginning of the ideal. This thought of catholicity was in the church from the beginning; in the teachings and prayers of the Master; in the philosophy of human redemption wrought out by Saint Paul in his epistles—a philosophy culminating in the final objective: "Till we all come to the measure of a perfect manhood in Christ." The goal of catholicity has always been in the future; but it was not meant to remain in the future always. Therefore, the hunger for unity is healthy, the demand is reasonable and the hope is justified by the elemental teaching of the evangel.

Church Unity

REMARKS ON DR. SCHAFF'S ARTICLE.[1]

By J. T. F. Farquhar, M.A., B. D.,
Rector of the Episcopal Church, Fochabers, Scotland.

In the great Unity movement we are at present at the stage of frankly individual expressions of opinion. Formal utterances of the various Churches interested can only embody and make effective progress that has already been won spiritually and intellectually. They must of course come in their due place, but we have not reached that yet. And even such an informal gathering as the World Congress now in preparation will yield a fruit that will be all the riper through the still more informal discussions that precede it. There is, therefore, no presumption or impropriety in the expression of their views by private persons. It is from the individualistic standpoint that I am writing now; and that, let it be noted, includes a conviction that I owe an unhesitating loyalty to the Church usually called the Episcopal.

It is to be recognized at the outset that the various Churches by their separate existence throw out a challenge to their neighbours to make clear what it is in their own constitutions that they consider to be vital as an element of catholic order, what highly desirable, and what of less value, and to give therewith their reasons. No doubt each Church will hold fast, as it should, to all that it believes to be essential in its Message, and it may be that fatal stumbling-blocks will be encountered there

[1] Dr. Schaff's article appeared in the June 1916 issue of the Constructive Quarterly under the title *The Movement Towards Church Unity.*

ere ever the question of organization be reached. But as it is from the conviction that we already hold substantially a common faith in the One Saviour that the Unity movement has arisen, so it is not unprofitable here and now to assume that it is on external considerations that the whole thing will turn sooner or later, and therefore that already they are a proper subject for informal discussion.

Many of the relevant points as between the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches were touched upon by Professor Schaff in a recent article in the CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY (June, 1916), and they could not have been expressed in a fairer or in a more friendly way. My purpose here is to deal with some of them in the hope of showing that in the deeper aspects of the matter we are not very far apart; and that, in the points wherein it may be we are not yet at one, a gain may be made in mutual understanding. That itself is a prerequisite, and possibly a fruitful prerequisite, of agreement. Dr. Schaff's article was not written precisely from the point of view in which I am here presenting it, and so in following him and picking out a point here and there I shall have to speak in a somewhat desultory fashion. But in the brief treatment which in any case is alone possible in a journal that will not be any great pity.

His foundation position that "on the pages of the New Testament one centre of Church Unity seems to be revealed and only one" is absolutely true in its own sphere. But it is not relevant in every region of the Unity question. An undiscerning application of statements such as that will lead, and indeed has led, to utter confusion of thought and misconception of other people's true meaning.

For there are possibly many definitions of the word "Church," and harmoniously with it of "Unity," and of "centre of Unity," and there is always great danger lest we apply the arguments and draw the deductions from one set of definitions while in reality we are speaking of the things themselves as defined by another.

Let us then make up our mind what we mean by the word "Church." Is it the sum of all those individuals in this world who with or without any external test, such as baptism, are spiritually united to God through faith in Christ? Or shall we introduce external things into our definition, such as open profession of faith and baptism for the individual, and, for their gathering together, some definite points of organization in corporate unity? On no two different definitions will the membership of the Church consist of identically the same individuals, and the need of care is evident. I have even heard people accuse others of narrow-mindedness, because while the latter were speaking of an organized body of believers in Christ, the former had made up their minds that the word "Church" necessarily included all who were willing recipients of God's Spirit even if they had never so much as heard of Christ. Let us then, for the purposes of this paper, define a Church as a company of baptized persons organized into a corporate unity on the profession of a sufficient Christian creed. The so-called creedless Churches are not really so. At least I was told that I should not be tolerated in them if I preached in their pulpits that atheism was well worth trying as a personal principle of life. The sufficiency of their creeds might be hard to establish, but that is another matter. With the above definition of *a* Church, our Unity movement might be described as the effort to find *the* Church, by an excellency, and always of course in the sphere of our definition.

But it is just here that Dr. Schaff's postulate is of little help. For Christ is no longer with us in the body. And even if He were, the case of the man who was casting out devils without commission either from Christ Himself or from His Apostles shows us that there would still be no identity between corporate and spiritual unity. And that Judas was an Apostle shows us the same thing from another side. How much more then in Christ's absence will it avail but little to recognize that He alone is the

true centre of Unity? Ought we then as our next and last step to abandon the whole sphere of the visibly constituted Church? No more than Christ for His part withdrew His commission and broke up the apostolic band.

Let us then continue. My postulate will be that a visible Church cannot achieve an organic unity by virtue of its direct dependence from an invisible Head, or be held together through any purely spiritual joints and bands. So then there would be no encroachment on Christ's prerogative if, in some small village where a split was threatened in the one existing Congregational communion, a speaker were to urge that a meeting should be called and the decision of the majority accepted by all on the ground that in that lay a true and valuable centre of Unity. And there would be as little necessary encroachment if a Roman Catholic were to urge that the Bishop of a given city was the centre of Unity for the whole Church. We need not concern ourselves just now as to how far those positions may or may not be correct, or even with the fact that the Roman in support of his case might advance certain considerations that would contradict the sole headship of Christ. In themselves they offer no contradiction to it and they illustrate the existence of a whole field of thought and action where the headship of Christ is the statement rather than the settlement of the question of Church Unity.

We are free then to consider a third principle which may help us to find a profitable centre of Unity. Let us look for it in the apostolic commission incorporated in the sanction of the old and regular ministry of the Christian Church of history. What the full content of that apostolic commission may have been, and how nearly it approached to supplying the complete ministerial sanction are not unimportant questions in themselves, but they do not vitally affect our present concern. Personally I believe that the essence of the commission lay in the

proclamation of the resurrection and of the remission of sins, and that in other respects where the ministry is truly representative of the people, the ministerial sanction likewise is to be regarded as essentially deriving its authority from the people, or at least through them. For those who preach the Gospel leave their converts free. The Apostles' unique position may have forced them at times to autocratic action, but it does not follow that autocratic authority was in itself part of their commission. Christ rather gives us a foundation and opportunity for brotherly unity than forces on us submission to earthly overlords. A ministry may rest in part upon the sanction of a certain responsibility given to certain chosen men by Christ, but it does not follow that it was by any express command that the body of the faithful accepted them. That acceptance would be no doubt the inevitable outcome of conformity with the words "He that receiveth you receiveth me," when all was going according to the will of God. Yet those words were surely spoken in the spiritual sphere and not as a rigid precept of external action; and as things do not always go according to the perfect Spirit of Christ, it is, to say the least, not obvious that when Christ's messengers were playing Him false, it would still remain the duty of Christ's true children to remain in external union with them at any cost of principles. They who reject the opportunity have to stand or fall before Him who gave it, and before Him alone. Such a sanction then for the ministry as we have conceived would be no rigid, crushing thing tending always to subject the spiritual to the external. With an elasticity full of wholesome tenderness for human weakness it might still in an extremity permit Christ's Church to fall into separate portions. But as at the first it bound the Church together in a real Catholic unity that endured for centuries, so it has never ceased, and will never cease, to supply an opportunity and a persuasion to men that they should draw together again

once more. No doubt like any external order it might be misused in an unspiritual way. But it does not invite the same result as would the existence of some one man unmistakably designated as the vice-gerent of Christ. A world-wide ministry could never obscure the fact that it was expedient for us that Christ, our one true Head, should be absent from us in the body.

If then any such ministerial sanction is to be found in fact we should surely cling to it in the fullest and most regular form attainable as a necessary element in any potentially catholic Church order that we might elaborate. In any ecclesiastical organization that might be devised so that Christians might work and worship together, no immediate and apparent gain could counterbalance the loss or obliteration of that priceless legacy even had it no other use than that which is before us. For it is itself the strongest foundation of visible unity that we could find. And to throw it away for the sake of speedier union on any other would be like throwing away the title deeds to an estate for a sum for immediate spending.

To the historical question whether any ministry has ever existed and still exists now carrying in its sanction an element which is humanly and externally apostolic, as from the mouth of Christ, we shall have to come sooner or later.[2] And so far as Dr. Schaff has touched upon it briefly I will do the same. With regard to the testimony of Ignatius he says indeed that the bishop is there presented as the "centre of unity," but only as "the representative of Christ, and not the representative of the Apostles," and that the Ignatian episcopate is "congregational, a presidency within the bounds of one congregation," with regard to sanction, I suppose he means, as well as with regard to operation. Well, to present any

[2] It may be proper to mention that I have elsewhere examined the historical evidence, to the best of my ability, in *The Visible Church*. (D. Wyllie & Son, Aberdeen.)

satisfactory view of the testimony of Ignatius, and even to arrive at the proper appreciation of the fervid comparisons whereby he sets out the dignity of the ministry would take more space than the CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY can well afford. But we may here show by two isolated passages that a fuller examination would probably justify us in saying that the Ignatian bishop is the centre of unity, not only of congregational work and worship, but also of an orthodoxy spread throughout the world. Orthodoxy, indeed, by its very nature is more than a merely congregational matter. These then are the words of Ignatius,—"Beware of such men (false teachers). And this ye shall do by humility, and by union with the God of Jesus Christ, with the bishop, and with the ordinances of the Apostles" (Trall. VII), and "Jesus Christ, our indissoluble life, is the mind of the Father as the bishops set throughout the world are in the mind of Christ" (Eph. III).

Moreover, these passages would also strongly suggest that the sanction of the episcopal office consisted in something more than could be generated by any chance body of baptized persons. For if the bishop as such was regarded as the representative of Christ it was due to more than a courteously assumed spiritual harmony. He was in fact, by the ordinances of the Apostles, the inheritor of all that could be permanent in the commission to preach the Gospel which Christ Himself with human lips had entrusted to them.

In this connection let me further cite these words in which Ignatius salutes the Trallians,—"the Church which is in Tralles which I salute . . . in apostolic character."

Bishop Lightfoot, indeed, seeing strangely an inconsistency between the full and natural sense of the phrase "apostolic character" and what follows, gives the rendering: "Hearty greeting in apostolic fashion." But the context, so far from contradicting, actually supports the sense which he discards. Ignatius goes on to tell the

Trallians how well their bishop, Polybius, had spoken of them, and he exhorts them to an orderly walk under his guidance, in which as it seems they had been somewhat lacking. Next he emphasizes the great dignity of the ministry. Finally, and these are the words on which Bishop Lightfoot stumbles, he adds,—"In love for you I spare you, being able to write to you more sharply on his behalf. But I am not minded, condemned man as I am, to give you directions as an apostle." Surely those words, so far from being a repudiation of all apostolic character, are rather a reminder that he was clothed with it by his office, but that through love and for the sake of edification he preferred to keep it in the background. It is to the Trallians alone that Ignatius sends greeting "in apostolic character," and the context shows very clearly the reason. He has to approach so near to a rebuke that he would remind them that he had a special responsibility in the things of Christ given him by an authority recognized by all, and that no one should resent his brotherly admonitions as the fussy interference of a presumptuous outsider.

To make the matter yet more abundantly clear let us see what Lightfoot's suggested interpretation would give us. Ignatius would open with a striking and unique expression which, however, would amount to no more than a bare comparison of his greeting with that of the Apostles, and that so nicely limited as to hold only with regard to heartiness. To say nothing of the difficulty of referring the "character" to the greeting itself instead of to the man who gives it, we may note also that there is no trace anywhere else of the assumed fact that the Apostles' method of greeting had become famous either for heartiness or for any similar quality. And with regard to the supposed repudiation by Ignatius of any true apostolic character it would be wholly irrelevant. For as the Trallians were rather ignoring and despising their own bishop, they would not be likely gratuitously to attribute

honour to the bishop of a neighbouring Church who had taken upon himself to remonstrate with them. His words would amount simply to an impotent and foolish regret that he did not possess that character.

To pass on, Dr. Schaff considers that in the study called for by the Church Unity movement "the non-episcopal bodies will bear new witness to the unsacramental and unsacerdotal character of the Church and the ministry as set forth in the pages of the New Testament. They will find a priesthood, but a priesthood of believers, not a priesthood mediating between Christ and the soul." With regard to the views of the episcopal Churches in these matters we may note that the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England declare, with the particular application of what is surely a general principle, that "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." And while there are many opinions as to the full content of the apostolic commission, it may well be that a finished study of the known facts will teach that it is rash to add anything to our Lord's own reported words, "Ye shall be my witnesses . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth." There are of course in fact many sacerdotal and sacramental questions still open, and they would continue to be so, even if we were to regard the ministry as being in respect both of rule and of worship essentially the representative organ of the whole body of believers. But in that surely there is an advantage, for those points are not of such a nature that those who differ from each other with regard to them must mutually excommunicate each other. Let me say then, for as I said I am writing from the frankly individualistic standpoint, that, while as with regard to the centre of Unity I might like to define and explain a little if I were fully to state my own views, I find no stumbling-block whatsoever in what I take to be the true sense of Dr. Schaff's words.

He goes on to ask whether "the ministry of the New Testament is not a charismatic ministry and ordination

at the hands of man chiefly a matter of expediency or orderliness." Dr. Schaff surely does not mean more than that in addition to the regularly ordained ministry charismatically gifted persons also exercised ministerial functions without having been themselves ordained. But it would not affect the value or the status of the regular apostolic ministry if it were to be found that in the infancy of the Church charismatic men had been welcomed and so also sanctioned as members of the ministry by those who in the regular order had the sanction to bestow. Nor, were that an established fact, in place of being a more or less plausible inference, would it follow that it would be a safe precedent for more settled times. Yet, so far as it implied no weakening or obliteration of the regular sanction of the ministry for after ages, there is a valuable suggestion here for the course that might be advisable in certain contingencies. Nor would it be necessary, seeing that external things were being dealt with, that all should place exactly the same construction upon what was being done.

It is interesting to note that the Pope claims that his sanction is sufficient to take the place of ordination. At least Hadrian II and John VIII did so.[3]

Further questions asked by Dr. Schaff are these:

(1) "Why, if bishops are the successors of the presbyter-bishops of the apostolic age, they are a different order from the presbyters." Some men so read the records that they can accept the hypothesis of that inquiry, and most certainly they must find an answer. They must decide whether those called bishops in subsequent generations obtained their unique positions with regard to ordination regularly or by force and fraud. And even if they decide on the latter alternative they will have to answer further the very practical question whether the office of presbyter was established as such a concrete indissoluble thing, and ordination is in its nature such a mechanical bestowal of

[3] Revue Internationale de Théologie, 1897, p. 467.

the same, that though no one knew it or intended it for centuries, the men who in later days were ordained presbyters were in fact clothed also with due authority to transmit their office.

(2) "Or, if it be alleged they are the successors of the Apostles, why they lost the name apostle." That could be a difficulty only to those who imagine that our Lord instituted a fully organized Church with rigid canons, definite ranks, and appropriate titles. That stage was yet to come, and it came by gradual crystallization round certain original elements, among which we believe the commission given to the first Apostles played an important part. Those Apostles were men standing out among their brethren through a unique personal relationship with Christ. The apostolic function itself as found in them had certain distinctive marks due to that personal closeness, even if in its own essential nature it could exist without those marks. In their own day, however, their unique preeminence would not be fully realized, and so we find that in their own day successors to the apostolic office did not lose the name apostle. Barnabas, Matthias, Silas, Timothy, Junias, Andronicus, and probably Epaphroditus are all called Apostles with more or less distinctness in the pages of the New Testament. But after a little time the immediate Apostles of Christ would necessarily stand out in a clear category by themselves, and even St. Paul would be included among them only by a distinct mental effort. Moreover, the outward aspect of the Church was changing from day to day; the episcopal office in the full modern sense of the term was not universally established for several decades; the bishop himself was a localized officer with a multitude of official duties of which his apostleship would be far from the most striking in the eyes of the people; the wonder would rather have been if the name of apostle had been retained as the official title of the Church officer in question.

(3) Why the bishops "do not possess the qualification

which Peter in the first chapter of the Acts laid down for a successor of Judas." I do not quite understand Dr. Schaff here. He surely does not mean that a man cannot receive, as from Christ on earth, the commission to preach the resurrection and the remission of sins unless he has been an eye-witness of the Gospel story; or that that qualification is necessary for any of the other functions which are in many quarters believed to have been included in the apostolic charge.

(4) "Why no mandate was given to the Apostles to appoint successors." There is certainly no such mandate recorded, and personally I believe that no such mandate was given, for St. Peter would surely have referred to it distinctly. But we are hardly in a position to make any dogmatic assertion that there was none and still less that nothing at all was said on the matter. Subject, however, to that reservation let us accept Dr. Schaff's ground, and we may perhaps without presumption explain it thus. Our Lord gave the Gospel mission which by its nature had no time limit of expiry and was bounded as to space only by the ends of the world. He gave it not only for its own immediate purpose, but also because He desired to offer to the Church a point or rather a line of rally, so that if men were fit for it they might the more easily accomplish the glory of visible practical unity in Himself. But He refrained at the same time from doing anything that would give undue and fatal force to the temptation to place any external regulation between God and the individual soul. On that point a great deal is very truly and forcibly said by the Rev. N. R. Best in his article on the *Free Church View Point* which appeared in the same number of the CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY as Dr. Schaff's. But where the writer goes on to blame St. Peter for recommending a successor to Judas I confess I cannot follow him. We may admit that St. Peter attached an undue importance to the number twelve and had a mistaken conception of the outward form under which the Kingdom

of Christ was going to develop. But it was assuredly the plainest common sense on his part as well as faithfulness to his own trust that he should take measures lest the definite responsibility for preaching the Gospel in its purity throughout the whole world should perish with himself and the original apostolic band.

The question how far in transmitting their commission, and in what cases, they differentiated between the working content of the commission and the due authority to transmit it is purely a historical matter, and one that merges naturally in that of an official ministry in a regularly organized Church. The glimpse of the Ignatian evidence given above shows of what nature the inquiry would be. It would begin, of course, in the canonical writings, and it would end in determining what men in the present day were most fully and regularly clothed with the apostolic character in the relevant sense of that term. That having been determined it would seem that the first question which would have to be asked by any Church that desired to advance as far as possible on the road of corporate unity would be whether its ministry was itself possessed of that character so far as existing conditions permitted it to be so in a manner compatible with the purity of the faith and the necessary spiritual liberty of its members.

Dr. Schaff most generously and candidly writes as follows: "Explain it as we may, there seems to be unmistakable evidence that within the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church there exists a very serious and pressing impulse in the direction of Church Unity. . . . And apparently it exists there in a form and with a devotional pressure as it does not exist in any of the non-Episcopalian Churches." Well, there is a deep and effective logic in facts which may lie long dormant as a seed in the winter soil, but will thrust its shoot upward when the season ripens to the possibility of growth. And the phenomenon which Dr. Schaff notices would be both explicable, and

even to be expected, if the Episcopal Church carried somewhere in her earthly constitution an element suitable as a basis for unity in the same external sphere.

In any case we may be absolutely sure of this, that if we attempt to found a visible Church directly upon an inward and spiritual principle we are bound to fail. And conversely also of this, that if, having defined our Church by the aid of some external thing, as we must, we go on to say that outward membership in it *in se*, apart from the schismatic spirit, is a test of the individual's nearness to God and a prerequisite of God's acceptance of him, then indeed the things that should have been for our health have become an occasion of falling. God uses externals, and they are useful for man who is at present a creature of this earth. But He sees through the shell and is independent of it. In any case the spiritual kernel is now ripe for germination, and God's grace through Christ is offered to every man and will not be frustrate through any lesser earthly thing.

What is Christian Experience?

By John Wright Buckham, D.D.,
Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.

In a previous article in The Constructive Quarterly[1] the writer outlined the essentials of a "Unifying Theology" based upon Christian experience. In the present paper it is his purpose to enquire more fully into the nature of the experience upon which such a theology is grounded.

The appeal to experience as the justification of Christianity is so strong that it might well be stronger. Its full strength cannot be revealed until it is subjected to the most thorough and critical examination. What is religious experience? How is it related to experience in general? What is the relation of Christian experience to racial religious experience? Until such questions as these are asked and answered many minds will refuse consent to a faith which comes to them clad only in its own native power, but without philosophic credentials. Only by a thorough critique of Christian experience can the convincing character of the claims of Christianity be disclosed.

I.

The term *experience* is very loosely used to cover physical sensation, mental activity, and spiritual knowledge. We speak of experiencing bodily pleasure or pain, as if it were our very selves who were pleased by a taste or hurt by a blow. Yet, at the same time, we know that it is

[1] Vol. III, No. 4 (December, 1915).

our body that is affected, rather than ourselves. Similarly, we speak with much more of a sense of closeness of identification—though it is noteworthy that here we do not customarily use the term experience—of understanding a mental proposition, as if we ourselves as personal intelligences recognized it as true (e.g. a geometrical demonstration). Yet here again, upon more careful thought, we realize that it is the mind, rather than the innermost self, that is involved in such knowledge. For our reasoning faculties are in a sense only instrumental to our deeper self, as is implied in the familiar lines,

> "A man convinced against his will
> Is of the same opinion still."

In religious experience, however, it is clear that the *very self* is involved far more completely and unreservedly than in either physical sensation or mental judgment. There is an authoritativeness, an uplift, a sense of reality and of conscious self-commitment in religious experience which give to it a singularly central and sacred place in human life. Its intensity may be transitory, but it leaves a vivid impress of abiding reality.

This is true of religious experience wherever it is found, —in a lesser degree in its lower and more primitive forms, in a higher degree in its higher forms. Whatever its cause, there is a certain commanding and serious quality in religion, when it is genuine, which sets it apart from all other forms of experience as possessed of far greater significance.

It must be granted that in some cases there is a revulsion from the intense consciousness of assurance of religious experience to what sometimes comes to seem the more solid though sceptical reality of reason; but in such cases there is almost invariably a sense of loss, as if one had been compelled to drop to a lower level to gain reality. And often there remains a lurking conviction that reality may lie, after all, in the more ideal realm.

II.

When we seek for the inner essence of religious experience we find ourselves confronted with such a multiplicity of beliefs, practices and emotions that it seems hopeless to fasten upon any one as definitive. And yet when one goes below all these to their root one comes upon something which, however elusive, however overlaid with corruptions, underlies all religion. It is what we call *spirit*, the supernatural, the divine. In its lower forms only a vague indefinite *mana;* in its higher, it rises into something worthy of the name of God. *Something or Someone* (either one or many) *beside oneself and other creatures and objects*—that is the consciousness that haunts the human mind and gives rise to what we term religion.

It is possible to explain this consciousness of a spiritual world as imaginary, marginal, unreliable. Certainly it is mystical in its nature. But its power over human life and its persistence do not readily admit of this explanation. It does not fade away as racial intelligence grows, but develops in strength and sanity. It not only allies itself to, but stimulates, a rational interpretation of the universe. The conviction arises that this religious experience is, *in itself*, rational, possessing a kind of elemental self-evidencing rationality that surpasses the bounds of ordinary reasoning. The basis of this conviction cannot here be examined. Suffice to say that it has strong support in the history of human thought.[2]

In the greater ethnic faiths this experience becomes rational, ethical, spiritual. In Christianity it attains its purest and most vital form. Its manifest superiority has led us to look upon Christian experience as something quite by itself,—original, new, unrelated; but a larger outlook convinces the student of religion that Christian

[2] For a further discussion of this subject see my *Mysticism and Modern Thought*, Chap. V.

experience is not something apart and alone. Rather is Christianity the culmination and fulfilment of the religious experience of the race, *revealed*, to be sure, but as the climax of a progressive revelation.

As the highest form of the racial religious experience, Christian experience has a definite character and content, distinguishing though not separating it from the experiential content of other religions. Just what this "essence" of Christianity is, has been of late the object of diligent quest.

Before endeavouring to define its content, let us not fail to recognize that *Christian experience* itself has assumed quite different forms in various stages of its history. The Christians of the second and third centuries, emerging from Judaism or paganism and standing face to face with martyrdom, had an experience differing in many ways from that of the Christian of to-day. So with the Christians of the Middle Ages, living in a well-nigh spent civilization, and confronting a supposedly imminent end of the world. The Roman Catholic type of experience exhibits a marked contrast to the Protestant. The evangelical and the liberal types of experience differ widely among themselves. It is hardly just to assert that one of these is right and all the rest wrong. To one brought up under the sway of evangelicalism it is quite natural to assume that his is the only genuine kind of experience; but he can hardly fail to recognize that the evangelical type is undergoing constant alteration. One kind of Christian experience may, it is true, be purer, higher, nearer to the heart of Christianity than others, but that does not prove that the others are false or fruitless. Each may grasp an aspect of the larger total experience.

III.

Is there, then, a *common* Christian experience which underlies and unites all of its forms,—as one ocean fills

many bays and inlets? If so, how shall we discover it? Not by merely going back to original Christianity, as Harnack would have us do; nor by taking it as a whole, in all the forms and phases of its development; nor by fixing upon the most highly developed form and making that the criterion. Rather, by seeking the underlying formative content common to all types of Christian experience and disentangling it as far as possible from the subordinate and temporal factors bound up with it.

Proceeding thus, we find that the common and constitutive root of Christian experience is the *bond uniting Christians to God through Christ.* It is his relation to Christ that makes the Christian a *Christian.*[3] It is true that Christ may be conceived in very different ways. To one Christian the historic Jesus may be central; to another the conception of the indwelling, living Christ. One may find the lineaments of Christ blend and lose themselves in those of the Spirit, or the Heavenly Father. To another, they may be confused and obscured in that of the Church, or the Virgin. Even so, these experiences—varying not only in clarity and potency but in truth and worth—may all of them, in differing degree, be infused and vitalized by the personality of Jesus Christ. In other words, the Christian experience is an experience of personal relationship to a Personal Spirit through the medium of an incarnate revelation,—however diversly that revelation may be mentally represented.

The Christian experience, centring thus in Christ, is a regenerative, or redemptive, experience. It imparts a new inner life. Whether this be chiefly through a sense of forgiveness of sin or of entrance into a larger, freer life, or both; whether it be sudden or gradual, is secondary. It is a new life. The terms in which this new life is represented differ widely; that again may be but a testimony to its reality. It is true that this renewing

[3] A very striking and beautiful expression of this truth is found at the beginning of the Second Epistle of Clement.

power of Christian experience has often become weakened and impoverished. Rationalistic and naturalistic tendencies of thought have overshadowed it. Conventional forms of Christianity have at times reduced it to a mere sense of secured safety. Nevertheless, through the whole stream of Christian experience runs this sense of a life renewed—a life imparted by Love, at cost of the sacrificial suffering which love entails when sin intervenes.

Once more, the Christian experience is an idealizing or prophetic experience. It is characterized by the active pursuit of an ideal,—individual and social. It is ever looking toward a goal. Something better on before, toward which men are to press,—that is part of Christian experience,—an experience of hope, but an experience still. It is thus not only individual but social in its nature.

Here, again, there has been enormous diversity of ideas and programs. Heavenly homes, New Jerusalems, imminent millenniums, new social orders to be won by labours together with God—all imaginable forms of the Kingdom of God—yet ever a *Kingdom*, of one sort or another. For this is part of the normal Christian experience; it looks for a better self and a better city. It is true that there have been periods in Christian life and thought when this spirit has been languid, when an alien temper of pessimism and stagnation has gained the ascendency. But a faith, as an individual, should be judged not by its lapses or its self-contradictions, but by its ruling temper and spirit.

It is needless to add that genuine Christian experience is a profoundly and vitally *ethical* experience. Otherwise it would have had no stable and enduring quality.

Christian experience, then,—if one may attempt to define what is too rich for definition—*is an individually enlightening and regenerative, ethically purifying, socially redemptive experience of God through the historical-spiritual person of Jesus Christ.* It is thus both the interpretation and the fulfilment of racial religious experience.

IV.

Compare this conception of Christian experience with older and more limited versions of it.

The common Protestant conception of the content of Christian experience goes back for its sanction into the beginnings of the evangelical movement. Its prevalence is probably due more to John Wesley than to any other single individual. The strength of Wesleyanism lies in the fact that it sees Christianity to be an experience,—not chiefly a belief or cult. The two essential elements of this experience are conceived to be conversion and sanctification. That which gives impulse and activity to both of these is the "testimony of the Spirit." The testimony of the Spirit is defined by Wesley as "an immediate impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God, that Jesus Christ has loved me and given Himself for me, and that all my sins are blotted out and I, even I, am reconciled to God."

That is an admirable statement of the Christian faith, but consider for a moment how much it presupposes. First, that there is a God and that there is a soul,—both of which, affirms the inquiring mind, are open to question and must be proved. It presupposes, also, a historic-spiritual person, Jesus Christ, who is of so exceptional a nature that He can know and love in all the ages each individual who turns to Him. Then, too, it involves the reality of sin, that sin has power to alienate the soul from God, and that this alienation may be removed through the mediation of Christ.

All this, Wesley would say, is a matter of experience and rests upon the experiential basis. And in the main it is true. Yet experience cannot establish historical fact, though it may witness to it, or of itself alone establish the doctrines here involved. The experience which Wesley calls "the testimony of the Spirit" is, evidently,

not the simple, isolated and self-supported fact which he assumes it to be. Historical and intellectual factors are involved in it. It does not come to the Christian as a solitary individual. It is social. It roots deep down in the primary religious impulse of the race. It is attached to a definite historic religion, which itself is closely related to an anterior faith and that again to a great family of religions.

Moreover, the Wesleyan is only one—though one of the purest and most vital—of the types of Christian experience. The author of the Epistle of James did not define his experience in such terms, neither did Justin Martyr, nor Ignatius, nor Augustine, nor St. Francis, nor Theresa, nor Luther. Yet they all represent genuine varieties of Christian experience and all shared much that Wesley experienced and he much that each of them experienced.

All of which clearly confirms the two truths we have already reached, (1) that Christian experience is far more inclusive and varied than we have been accustomed to regard it, and (2) that its forms and effects are largely moulded by ideas or doctrines.

What, then, is the relation of ideas to experience in the realm of Christian faith? Do the ideas beget the experience or the experience the ideas? We have already taken the ground that the experience is primary and the ideas, or doctrines, secondary. This is further indicated by these two patent facts. First, Christian experience is manifestly far deeper and worthier than its doctrinal statement. To say this is not to reflect upon the doctrines, but to magnify the experience. The doctrines are essential and valuable interpretations of the experience, but they are inferior to it, as words are less than thoughts. Nor is it to exalt emotion. For to define experience as emotion is no more adequate than to define it as idea. Idea and emotion invariably attend experience—perhaps we should say are parts of it—but it is greater and deeper than they.

Again, not only is the Christian experience greater and deeper than Christian doctrine, but often the doctrines, especially as formulated by individuals, are plainly out of accord with the experience. How often we meet with Christians of an intense and profound experience, eager to present theories which (perhaps owing to a lack of intellectual training) are painfully short of, or even contradictory to, the experience which we can detect burning warm and true beneath the smoke which issues from it. Their ideas fail to represent their experience, and not seldom misrepresent it. The failure to recognize this discrepancy between idea and experience, doctrine and truth, has led to endless confusion and misunderstanding.

Once more, Christian doctrines change more or less with changing social and intellectual environment. They cannot be detached from the total life and thought of the age. Experience changes too. Only, the latter has a far deeper continuity from age to age. The *like-mindedness* of men in all ages is a fact, in spite of their differences,—but their *like-heartedness* is a still greater fact. Paul's doctrines, for example, appeal to us still, as embodying universal truths, however changed our environment; but Paul's experience is far nearer and dearer to us than are his doctrines.

V.

Experience first, doctrines second. That is the natural order. Only, there is no interval between; for as soon as experience begins, thinking begins,—just as the shoot springs from the swelling seed. Christ first, then Christology; the new birth, then a doctrine of regeneration; the consciousness of forgiveness, then a doctrine of atonement; progress in holiness, then a doctrine of sanctification,—and so on.

Yet doctrine, once formed, begins to colour—shall we not say also to *arouse?*—experience. When a church

communion has once become established doctrinal instruction begins as early as, sometimes even earlier than, the experience. In this way have come into existence types of Christian experience so wedded to certain doctrinal presuppositions—as, e.g., Roman Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal—and thus wearing so different aspects that they have hardly been able to recognize each other as Christian. And yet, granted the presence, in all sects, of ideas and practices which can hardly be called less than corruptions, there is in each a residue of experience that is genuinely Christian. And upon the basis of this common experience, and the common body of doctrine arising from it, unity is made possible, *if only we are willing to go beneath the surface to the experience underlying it.*

The effect of doctrine upon experience is something to which the Church should give careful attention. For doctrine may exercise either a restrictive and devitalizing or a releasing and stimulating influence upon experience. Experience should have room to expand and create new doctrinal forms and expressions. Otherwise, it either ferments, or loses its vitality. A doctrine, or rather a doctrinal formulation, that to one generation is an aid to experience may to the next be an encumbrance.

For example, the experience of sin is one of the permanent factors of the religious consciousness, essential to the realization and progress of the religious life. As such it is peculiarly clear and poignant in Christianity,—leading to certain doctrines which in evangelicalism have been extremely potent in arousing Christian experience, e.g., to the doctrines of total depravity and everlasting punishment. Yet both of these doctrines do violence to another equally fundamental constituent of religious experience,—the consciousness on the part of humanity of honest endeavour to do right and of the consequent approval of God. Side by side these two apparently hostile constituents of the religious experience—consciousness of worth and consciousness of sin—have dwelt

together in our humanity, and even in the same breast. To be true to human experience, both of them should be recognized. The theology which recognized human sin only and ignored human goodness, for a long time held sway over the larger part of Protestantism,—and wrought mightily, because it was true to one hemisphere of experience. Yet because it was an exaggeration, because it ignored a section of experience which should not have been ignored, for this among other causes it has now come about that the doctrine of sin has lost much of its hold upon our generation and the experience itself has been blunted by reaction.

Doctrine must be constantly squared with experience, or such results are sure to follow. The place of logic in theology must be subordinated to the deeper realities of experience. Then the interplay of the two will be normal and fruitful.

Take another illustration. The doctrine of Providence —one of the most characteristic yet difficult doctrines of Christian faith—is based upon experience of providential direction in one's own and in the general life. That experience has led to a doctrine of Providence which attempts an indiscriminating application of the experience of individual Divine guidance to the whole realm of humanity and nature. But here arise insuperable difficulties. Obstinate facts emerge which refuse to yield to an easy and roseate doctrine of Providence. As a consequence a subtle distrust of the doctrine diffuses itself. The scientist raises his eyebrows; the Christian himself begins to wonder and doubt. The doctrinal instinct has overreached itself and constructed too soaring a doctrine,—one which falls of its own weight. Thus the doctrine of Providence has, especially in the light of the Great War, come to seem to many a fabric of fancy. What is the course to be taken? Is it not to go back to the base-line of experience and start over again, asking, What is this experience? What does it involve as to the

relation of God to my life and that of others?—and then to study the facts and laws of history and science, as well as of experience, and thus to build up a doctrine of Providence which is true both to experience and to the world in which we are living. The result may be very modest and incomplete, but it will at least be true to all the facts involved.

The relation of religious experience to cult is another subject which calls for more careful study. What is the influence of social ceremony in arousing and renewing individual experience? How far do common worship, the use of prayer and praise, rite and symbol, arise out of experience and promote it? And how far are they in danger of becoming substitutes for it? Here lies the key to cult as well as to doctrine.

Thus the return to experience, conceived in an ampler way than heretofore, as the source both of doctrine and cult, brings a fresh revelation of the fundamental nature of all religion, reveals the universality of Christianity as the interpretation and fulfilment of the religious life of humanity and throws a flood of light on the nature and function of theology. Best of all, it reveals the basis and hope of a unified Christendom.

Christianity and Hindu Character

By Gilbert Clive Binyon, M.A.

I

"In our personal capacity as Indian, as Hindu and especially as Arya Samajist," writes Mr. Lajpat Rai in his book on the *Arya Samaj* (p. 266), "we hope that the Hindus will be true to the faith of their forefathers, and will not change their national character so completely as would be involved by their becoming Christians."

Later in the same volume (p. 283), the author refers to the fact that "the India of today is not exclusively Hindu." "Its prosperity and future," he adds,—these are the closing words of the book,—"depend upon the reconciliation of Hinduism with that greater *ism*—Indian Nationalism—which alone can secure for India its rightful place in the comity of nations. Anything that may prevent, or even hinder, that consummation is a sin for which there can be no expiation."

The mention of a reconciliation of Hinduism with Indian Nationalism indicates a certain disharmony between the two; and the whole paragraph suggests that this disharmony is to be done away by the modification of the former of the two; Hinduism must be reconciled with Indian Nationalism, not *vice versa*.

We may conclude, then, that Mr. Lajpat Rai definitely contemplates and desires some modification in the faith of his forefathers; this, as we see from what is said earlier (pp. 252–260), involves some, and indeed a considerable, change in the national character.

It would be superficial to suppose that the hope which is also expressed that the Hindus will be true to the faith of their forefathers is nothing but the result of a conservative habit of mind, and that a continued loyalty to Hinduism springs simply from a failure to recognize, or unwillingness to face, in its full significance, the disharmony referred to above. The conservative tendency, and the readiness for transformation, are not by any means so antagonistic to one another as might appear. The attachment to Hinduism, combined with a desire for comprehensive changes, is due to the belief that India is the vehicle of some precious spiritual treasure, of the utmost value to the world, the loss of which would be the loss of India's soul.

Sister Nivedita (Miss Margaret Noble) once expressed the hope that India is destined to become "the Guru and instructor" of all other nations (*Religion and Dharma*, p. 15).

The spiritual treasure in virtue of which India might, as some claim, become the world's religious teacher might be described as a truer "scale of values," an estimation of human qualities and virtues in an order more consonant with the highest nature of man; but such a description does not go far enough; all this, in the field of behaviour or character, is the result of some more profound characteristic. "The East is spiritual, the West material" is the phrase in which the matter is sometimes stated; but this is unjust to "the West" and inaccurate with regard to "the East"; a better way of expressing what is meant by "spiritual" is to speak of a profound sense of the unity of all existence.

The assumption that all being and life coheres in one ordered system, and that religion consists in recognizing an identity with or inherence in or utter subordination to the divine scheme,—this assumption, colouring the whole outlook, dominates that consciousness and character which India will not part with willingly.

Associated with this assumption or conviction of the unity of all existence are several thoughts or mental tendencies which fit in naturally with it. There is a tendency to thought rather than to action; there is an idea of personality within which life is conceived as social or universal rather than as individual; there is a tendency towards determinism; there is the idea of absorption into God as the final destiny; there are the ideas of *karma* and rebirth; and these together form one whole, a system of thought of which the fundamental assumption is that of unity.

II

A great contrast to all this is offered by what may be called the characteristically "Western" form of the Christian Religion.

In this, there is a highly individualized conception of personality. Men were created for fellowship with God and with one another by obedience to the Divine commands. Through sin, men fell away, rebelling against God. In the fullness of time, God sent His Son Jesus Christ into the world, Who by His perfect sacrifice made propitiation and atonement, opening up a way of salvation; for all who believe, and avail themselves of the appointed means of grace, obeying God's Will and seeking to extend His Kingdom, there is redemption from sin and from God's judgment upon it.

It seems as though there were a good deal of justification for Mr. Lajpat Rai's opinion that for Hindus to become Christians involves something like a complete change of national character.

That Christianity has been apprehended in different ways in various places and at various times is indisputable; as the Christian Religion has come in contact with other religious points of view, flourished amidst peoples of differing types and varying political and economic condi-

tions, and been expressed in differing languages, it has felt the influence of all these circumstances. The effects of all that may be included in the phrase "national character" may be traced in the history of the Christian Church.

This idea of national contributions towards the fuller apprehension of the Christian Faith in all its completeness may, it is thought and hoped by many Christians today, bring it to pass that, while Christianity spreads, national characteristics are not altogether changed, nothing of permanent value being lost; in this way, it is believed, the Church will itself be enriched by becoming the better able to appreciate and understand the Faith, through new national contributions to Christian thought.

The method by which such contributions may be made, the means by which they may be expected to come, is a matter which has not received the attention it deserves.

It is quite clear that convinced Hindus, Muhammadans, or others are not very likely to wish to help Christians to understand their own religion better; it is not from this quarter that contributions are to be expected; it would be necessary that they should first embrace the Faith, and, as St. Paul says, "how shall they hear without a preacher?" What usually happens is one of two things; either, by a natural reaction, the convert becomes as "Western" as anyone else, being attracted precisely by the contrast and difference from his former outlook with which he has become dissatisfied; or else, carrying over his mental habits into his new faith, apprehending the points of similarity rather than of difference, he becomes what must in truth be called imperfectly Christian. On these lines, no real contribution is made.

It is, of course, extremely difficult, not only in religious matters, but in every field of thought, to pass from one point of view to another without going through an intermediate stage of exaggerated and unnecessary antagonism

to the first position; the usual and natural course of mental progress is, in many cases, by alternations, the swing of the pendulum. It is very probable, then, and only what we should expect, that these two results just mentioned will continue to be produced.

The way in which influences external to the Church bring about contributions towards a fuller understanding of the Christian Faith involves a method already familiar not only to missionaries and to mission preachers, but to all preachers, and indeed to propagandists of every kind, not to mention advertisers. This method consists in studying the mental position and attitude of the person approached with a view to presenting the idea or belief that is to be spread in such a way that it will be seen to be the answer to a felt need.

It would appear, then, that that special aspect or presentation or apprehension of Christianity which constitutes the contribution to Christian thought may be expected, in the first instance, from persons following this method, rather than actually from those to whose characteristic mentality the contribution is really due; but the impetus and rapid spread may well come from those who hear these persons.

III

Let us now inquire what is the form of the sense of need in the particular case which we are considering.

The opinion is sometimes expressed that modern educational studies, such as history, and in particular, sciences, are so subversive of Hindu religion and Indian mental characteristics generally, that these latter must in time disappear before them.

But the so-called "conflict between Religion and Science" is nothing but the reluctance of theologians to admit the scientific method into their province and the reluctance of scientific workers to recognize any *data*

other than sense-impressions. And if, in scientific studies, there is a patient and reverent examination of detailed facts, while, in the case of Indian thought, attention is given rather to principles, to the eternities and immensities, there is, nevertheless, a remarkable similarity between one temper, the really characteristic one, engendered by science and that which Hinduism presupposes; in both, that is, there is a vivid sense of cosmic order and unity. The thought of the uniformity of nature, the contemplation of the vast vistas of time and space which scientific study has opened out, and the notions of determinist psychology, produce, like the doctrines of *karma* and rebirth, a sense of man's inherence in the whole scheme of things.

A far more potent solvent of Indian characteristics is to be found in the spread of modern civilization and industry. Railways and motor-cars, roads, canals, and irrigation-works, factories and workshops, with the British *Raj* over all, make it difficult to sustain the reverent, joyful sense of Divine Order; it becomes antagonized, or even superseded, by a sense of exasperation. A desire is awakened for an active reaction to stimulus. The Aggressive Hinduism of Sister Nivedita, the religious and social ideals of the Arya Samaj, and Practical Vedanta as engagingly set forth by Swami Ram Tirtha, agree in this, that action is included within and made an integral part of religion.

But the deliverance from a sense of disturbance and distraction is more apparent than real. The principle of action, by itself, cannot do more than substitute a kinetic in place of a static universe; the consciousness of unity and of inherence in the Divine scheme remains, and that is the attraction of Practical Vedanta; but the disturbance and antagonism of the outer world also remain, and the principle of action, as understood by Swami Ram Tirtha, is too much like a complaisant acceptance of environment to afford a real deliverance from its antagonism to Indian

thought. And the same is true of other writers wherever, or in so far as, there is not a breaking away from the idea of unity and inherence in the universe.

In the case of those who become dissatisfied with Hindu Religion, there is felt the need of a Message which will make active participation in the world of today compatible with the underlying consciousness of the unity of all existence. Apart from this, the radiant exaltation and experience of universal light of him who says, I AM THAT, is only too apt to pass over into the dark "night in which all cows are black," into world-weariness and distaste for life.

IV

"While I was musing, the fire kindled:
Then spake I with my tongue,
'Lord, make me to know my end,
And the measure of my days, what it is;
Let me know how frail I am.
Behold, thou hast made my days as handbreadths;
And mine age is as nothing before thee:
Surely every man at his best estate is altogether vanity. . . .
Surely every man walketh as a shadow:
Surely they are disquieted for vanity:
He heapeth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them.
And now, Lord, what wait I for?
My hope is in thee.'" (Psalm 39.)

The Septuagint version suggests that while man's life is in itself altogether vanity and a mere shadow, when he hopes in the Lord, this *confidence* becomes for him *the substance of personality* (ἡ ὑπόστασίς μου παρὰ σοί ἐστιν.) Enduring reality and self-existence are to be found in Him alone who has revealed Himself as I AM THAT I AM.

It was to Moses, as he was meditating and brooding over the wrongs and unhappy experiences of his fellow people, that this revelation came; and it was in and through the desire for and effort after righteousness that the people of Israel sustained communion with the eternal Being of God.

There may seem something humiliating about thus entering, not simply into action,—that can easily be combined, at least for a time, with an essential passivity and sense of inherence in the totality of things,—but into a form of action which involves the conflict of individuals; it may seem like a surrender of all that is precious, a monstrous throwing-away of self-less adhesion to the Divine, to come down to these lower levels, and to compress personal life into one's own individual existence; must not this end in becoming one among many, in a world of sordid struggle from which all consciousness of ultimate reality has departed? But those who adventure on this way find that the moral discrimination, the sense of sharp contrast, and the acceptance of the claims of social justice, minister to, and secure, the fundamental sense of unity. A temporary, relative, and conditional ethical dualism is the condition of permanent belief in or consciousness of the real unity of all existence; under finite and temporal conditions, the universal light and bliss of the beatific vision can only be apprehended as the ideal and future triumph of a present struggle.

It is faith in the Incarnation, the belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the Word made flesh, that not only makes these thoughts credible, but enables us to welcome them. The Incarnation reveals the world of time and space and the particularities of circumstances as a sphere of Divine energy; there is a true, if relative, reality in life as conditioned by the environment of the finite.

In this connection the doctrine of the *kenosis* is full of significance; the explosion into action which occurs as the result of thinking one's self to a standstill is here sanctioned and directed, and converted from a reckless and almost defiant concession to ignorance into the very means whereby inherence in the Divine is maintained. It shows us that, so far from losing selflessness, we enter on the path of attaining it, when we heartily admit an ethical

dualism within the metaphysical unity, and our identification with humanity is raised from a ready compliance with other peoples' wishes into a fellowship of suffering, a sym-pathy and com-passion, which urges us to wage war on behalf of right relations between man and man. Very important is the quotation from the eighty-second Psalm in St. John 10 : 34–36: "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I AM the Son of God?" In the Psalm it is written, "I have said, Ye are gods, and ye are all the children of the Most Highest. But ye shall die like men,"—why? Because they have given wrong judgment and accepted the persons of the ungodly, because they have not defended the poor and fatherless, and have not seen that such as are in need and necessity have right. The energy of costly labour for righteousness is the price and condition of highest spiritual privilege for "divinities on earth," as Swami Vivekananda once called us all.

Approached in this way, Christianity assumes a special aspect or presentation. The "contribution" thus made to the fuller apprehension of Christian truth may be described as a new attention to the distinctively Johannine theology and appreciation of its points of difference from other New Testament writings. A few points, out of many, may be touched on.

The doctrine of Redemption disappears in that of the New Birth or Birth from Above (St. John 3). The contrast, instead of being, as in the early Pauline and the characteristically "Western" theology, that between the sense of sin and guilt and the experience of forgiveness, is that between "light" and "*darkness*," between "eternal life" and "*perishing*." What appears to be meant by, or

included in the meaning of, those phrases in St. John's Gospel is that sense of the futility of human life which like the darkness of night follows close on the light of happiness and exaltation apart from stern moral discrimination and purpose. Miracles appear as signs, signifying the subordination of the earthly and material to the moral and spiritual, thus bearing witness at once to the antagonisms and unity of the universe.

V

Two final thoughts remain for mention.

The first has to do with the distinction referred to above between a principle of action, by itself, and a moral principle directive of action. This distinction is, of course, vital for the future of Indian Nationalism. Well may Sister Nivedita exclaim, "Do we want to see India turned into a pale copy of America? God forbid!" Yet it is the zest of action, bustling restless energy and power, that have made the lands of "modern civilization" what they are, regions where there is, indeed, much that is admirable but more that is deplorable. Just in proportion as it is simply the principle of action that is recommended in place of traditional passivity, India will cease to be Indian. The form of action which harmonizes with the consciousness of unity is that universalist and equalitarian ethic of the prophets of Israel, which the Christian Church has taken over and which, through the influence of the Social, and in particular the Socialist, Movement, is now being restored to its true place, from which since the Industrial Revolution it had fallen.

The second is this: if "East" means the sense of the Unity of all existence and of man's inherence in the scheme of things, and if "West," so far as religion is concerned, means the point of view which takes it for granted that Christian faith always starts with a sense of sin, guilt

and desire for forgiveness, East and West will never understand one another—until they give up trying to do so, and endeavour, instead, to understand Christ.

Saint Lore in the East

[The following papers are by two Russian sisters. Nadejda Vladimirovna Brusilova (wife of the famous Russian general, Alexei Alexeilvich Brusiloff and sister of Vera Vladimirovna Johnston, well known to readers of this journal) was born in Tiflis, the metropolis of the Caucasus, and went with her sister to school there. The name of their parents was Jelihovsky. On their mother's side there had been many women writers, some of international reputation. Among the men of the family there have been no authors but many with military and administrative careers of distinction. During the last ten years, ever since the Japanese campaign, Madame Brusilova has given all her time to war sufferers, crippled soldiers, orphaned children, the hungry, the sad, the helpless. She has sent hospital supplies, Easter and Christmas gifts—literally by the car load—to the soldiers at the front; she has found tools and means of possible livelihood for those returning to the rear, to impoverished homes, unable any more to work in the fields,—all this and much more Madame Brusilova has made her concern. Beside the general work for hospitals she has two branches of activity peculiarly her own. One dates from the Japanese War. The Brother's Help she calls it. It works in the rear, attending only those who come home unfit for the usual pursuits of life and helping them until they die or are able to stand alone. The other is more recent, adapted from the French "filleul" idea, to supply the strict necessities and a few pleasures at the front. Hers is a busy life made possible by native kindness and rare personal charm.]

I

In The Caucasus

By Vera Johnston.

Far away in a distant corner of the general map of Europe there are two seas, the Black and the Caspian. A mountain chain runs from the one to the other, slanting down in the southernmost part. Even on a small map you can see that it is a very mighty mountain chain. And geography books say that some of the summits are fifteen thousand feet high, or eighteen, or even over twenty—rather mighty! Yet mightiest of all they are as they stand in the land of my memory.

This is the Caucasian range, or as we call it in Russian —Kavkaz. Tiflis, the ancient semi-Asiatic town where I was born and went to school, is curiously situated. Except in the south, which is open to the uncontrolled flow of the Kura, a great river, too swift for navigation, Tiflis is so closely pressed by mountains, so walled in all round, that one might almost imagine that it was built in an impossibly wide volcano crater. The place is unbearably hot in summer, though you are never out of sight of at least some snow higher up on the hills.

The range nearest to the city is hardly more than hillocks, rather barren, a dusty grey most of the time, but incredibly green after a heavy rainfall in the autumn, and bright red in spots when whole fields of poppies are in blossom. Farther away stretch the thickly wooded southern slopes of the range, on the highest line of which the snow never melts. From whatever point of Tiflis you may look, you are sure to see some distant spot where some great Christian achieved his salvation and taught thousands of others: St. Antonios of Martcobi (wild lilies of the valley grew so thickly around his church, not so very long ago in ruins, now restored); St. Shio of Mgvim; St. David of Garreja; the other St.

David, after whom a hill is named, in whose shadow was built a considerable part of Tiflis, the most European part too, with fine houses, paved streets and public squares. And St. Nina, especially St. Nina, a holy maiden of Syria who brought the light of Christ, in 314, to the Georgians.

Georgians is what Europeans for some inexplicable reason call this handsome and stately dark-haired race, who are good fighters and faithful Christians of the Orthodox Church. Russians who have lived together with them, who have worked and prayed with them and for over a century have almost identified themselves with them, call them Grusini; they call themselves Kartveli, in their own tongue.

But Kartveli or Georgians, these people belong to one of the earliest Christian Churches, who, persecuted, impoverished and assassinated by both Persians and Turks, not to mention the Cherkess and the Kurds, withstood the Mussulmans in spite of all, were never Islamized, and are as good and earnest Christians today as they were in the fourth century.

When at the beginning of last century, their last kings and independent princelets realized that they could not hold out any more against the destructive hatred of Mussulmans assailing them on all sides, they asked the Russians to help them. Ever since Christianity came to Russia, some six centuries after their own conversion, the Georgians had known of the millions upon millions of Russians to the north of them who were their brothers in faith. Since then the two nations have become brothers politically also, and have worked in all the other regions of human life more or less peacefully.

But the slaughter of Christians by the Mussulmans! They did it century in and century out, sometimes for gain, sometimes for revenge; at other times it would almost seem as if they did it merely out of sport. There were no Lord Bryce investigating commissions then to

report Georgian horrors as Armenian horrors have been reported.

Mzhet, the ancient capital of Georgia, has been plundered and demolished time and again. And in the thickly wooded hills miles around the ruins of churches, unburied human skeletons had been very commonly found as recently as the latter part of the nineteenth century. At the approach of the Mussulmans the villagers hastened out of their valleys up to the stronghold of churches built partly against and partly in the solid rock of the ledges. Here they weathered the storm, while their homes were being burned and pillaged, and went back patiently to their sheep, their fruit gardens and their fields of maize, if they were lucky. If they were not—well, sudden death was frequent and varied in those days. Hence sun-bleached, wind-dried human bones found here and there in the wilderness. Hence also the silent ruins of monasteries, whose brotherhoods, together with the villagers they always were ready to shelter in time of need, had been massacred to a man, whose priests died at the altars with the holy chalice in their hands.

There are many such ruins in the land of my childhood, some of them so difficult of access, the steep mountain paths being strewn with huge boulders and overgrown with dense creepers and thorns, that we only knew of them. Others were within possible reach of the sturdy little legs of mountain-bred children.

There we had been taken on occasions half picnic, half pilgrimage as soon as we had outgrown the baby stage.

Sometimes Jason went with us. Jason was Georgian and knew but a few words of Russian. But this presented no difficulty to our intercourse. Jason could smile very nicely to children; the corners of his fine dark eyes wrinkled in a most kindly way, and his teeth glistened as if in confirmation of the theory that people who use no metal when cooking or eating stand a better chance with

their teeth. In the steepest places, or in crossing frisky little mountain torrents, Jason also could carry us, sometimes me, sometimes my sister, sometimes the two of us, one on each shoulder. He was a very old man when we knew him, for there was a story current about his father and himself, as a growing boy, which dealt with conditions and ways in the Caucasus before the Russians came. After the lapse of all this time, I cannot tell Jason's story very consecutively, but I remember clearly that we were told that in his boyhood, during one of the Mussulman raids, his beautiful sisters had been taken to be sold into the harems of Constantinople, his little brothers had all been killed in a most merciless way, and his mother became insane, having seen her little children brained. Jason only survived. After this his father had lived for revenge only. Homeless and lawless, in war or by solitary exploit, the man made the killing of Mussulmans the purpose of his life. And every time he had killed one he came back to his tumble-down hut, where his insane wife still lived, a charge on the village headman and the priest of their church. He came back bringing the hands of his fallen enemy; he always cut them off at the wrist of the dead man. Scores of these were nailed on the walls of the hut, and stayed there decayed or decaying. Little Jason always went with his father and became of great assistance to him, growing into a handsome and sturdy youngster, skilled in the art of fighting and hard of heart. While taking his grim revenge on the slayers of his children, Jason's father remained a good Christian, a good Orthodox believer in his own opinion, and Jason was brought up in the same belief. Church festivals, saints' days, religious processions, Jason always attended them, and a fine figure he must have cut at them, I feel sure, when I think what a handsome old man he was and how graceful was his beautifully built, powerful body, when I, a fair-haired child of a northern race travelled on his mighty shoulder,

knowing nothing of his grim antecedents and caring less.

People who had known Jason a long time said he never spoke of himself; still some shreds of rumour, at least, could not be kept from trailing into our nursery after this unusual personality. The change of heart came to Jason when he was a middle-aged man, and in this way. The long forgotten grave containing the undecayed remains of a great saint of God had been recovered,—somehow, it seems to me, it was that of St. Antonios of Martcobi. Great multitudes of people came to the ceremony of consecration, and Jason drifted along with them. A solemn liturgy and Te Deum were sung, the undecayed remains of the saint were deposited with much pomp in a bronze coffin in a new stone vault, and above in the chapel the people pressed, according to the custom of the Eastern Church, to kiss the image of the saint, and Jason drifted along too. But when bending over the image Jason prepared to kiss the hand of the holy old man, he could not do it: the hands of the painted image were cut off at the wrists. But the true change of heart began to work only when Jason realized that all the others could and did kiss the saint's hand, that they were cut off for him only. From that day on for Jason the hands of all the images, of the Virgin Mary, of saints and angels, were cut off at the wrists in all the churches to which he became irresistibly drawn. He understood it as a sign of his own unworthiness, for "if you love them that love you what reward have ye? But I say unto you . . . do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." That was true Christianity! And as vehemently as he had in his youth helped his father's revengefulness, he now in his maturity sought the forgiveness of God, first for his father, by that time long dead, and then for himself.

How, by what sacrifice, what self-imposed discipline, what nightly vigil and ardent prayers,—I do not know,

but I am quite certain that Jason obtained forgiveness, and in his old age, at least, was at peace.

Otherwise how could he smile at us with so much humorous kindness when my little sister, unable to resist the temptation, pulled his fine iron-grey locks? Or how could he be so skilled in making such lovely little baskets of tree bark for us to gather berries in?

My mother also had known him when she was a little girl, and she said that in the forties and fifties of the nineteenth century Jason was already well known to Russian authorities. For whenever the ruins of some ancient church were to be restored, or a path cleared for pilgrims in the wilderness, or digging and carrying was to be done in connection with any of the holy places of Georgia, which the Turks or the Persians had demolished, and the Russians tried to restore, Jason always volunteered his services and enlisted other willing helpers. And let it be understood that in those days in that country no one would have dreamed of accepting money for any work done for penance or as a token of glad devotion to the Church of Christ.

Among the people of whom I speak, their interests and traditions being what they were, the Apostolic days and the Apostolic work seemed not far distant. The sense of a real and direct connection was felt between that which was being done by the common every-day people around us and that accomplished, for instance, by Nonna, the mother of St. Gregory the Divine, whose Christianity still bore the fresh impetus of St. Paul, who had preached to her own grandfather. She had been a woman just like St. Nina, educated in the same way, surrounded by the same conditions, speaking the same language, quoting the same proverbs and poets. And St. Nina had walked and worked just in the places where we could walk whenever we wished. Her hair bound a cross of vine branches when she needed the symbol and could not obtain it quick enough for her preaching, and

the people about us knew it was her hair, and that her slender fingers had twisted the branches. With the beautiful stretch of the fertile valley of Cakhetia which St. Nina so much loved that she wanted to be buried in sight of it we, too, were familiar and admired it as much.

To be sure, the miraculous lore of my childhood home in the mountains also comprised the legend of the cloak of Our Lord, which a pious Jew, on a Passover pilgrimage to Jerusalem, received from one of the soldiers who cast lots for it at the foot of the Cross on Golgotha, and then returning to his home in the Caucasus, buried in the ground, where the clairvoyant eyes of one of the Syrian preachers three centuries later, were enabled to recover it. In Moscow at one of the entrances of the Kremlin there is a chapel with an ancient image of the Virgin Mary with the Holy Babe; an image greatly reverenced by Russians and well known to foreign tourists. This image, painted as a portrait by one of the Evangelists, came to the distant northern capital from Palestine also by way of Syria and Georgia. It is the famous "Iverskaya," the Mother of God of Iveria. Iveria is one of the names of ancient Georgia.

And for people like Jason the sense of the uninterrupted connection with the interests, tasks, and individuals of the early Christian days must have been even more a matter of course than for us, since we lived in the same surroundings with the same traditions, but had more to distract our attention, children though we were.

For instance, there was a place in the mountains that had been the scene of a great blasphemy in the past, and the very first thunder storm after it was committed brought hail stones which turned to real stones. We knew the place and picked the stones quite frequently. Yet the German tutor of some older children said they were not produced by any thunder storm, that they were an unusual quartz formation. He said that mixing hon-

est geology with trumpery theology was just "eine echte Dummheit." Of course I did not believe him, when I was seven. I am not sure that I quite believe him now. But my attention had been distracted by him and the integrity of my sense of connection between cause and effect in the moral world had received a shock.

Jason never received such shocks, he simply could not receive them. Therefore it was most profitable and delightful to go on pilgrimages with him. And as he knew all the different paths in the woods, and all the holy places and was agreeable and capable on all occasions, it was a cause for rejoicing if he went with us to some green monastery.

All the ecclesiastical ruins in the Caucasian mountains were in the days of my childhood called "green monasteries," probably because they were ivy covered, or because they stood in the green gloom of the forests. Anyhow it is of a collective green monastery, composed of the most characteristic points of many, as I remember them, that I wish to speak.

A narrow trail in the woods—beech, oak and walnut, —the trail unmarked, indistinct, visible only to the keen eyes of pilgrims. Dense green shade all around us, with here and there breaks of violent sunshine dancing in the leaves and scattering sparks of fire in the water underfoot. At times the break widens and you see endless vistas of wooded hills, ravines, precipices. Then the dense green shade once more and the tramp of our feet and our heavy breathing. Going in a file but keeping time was considered less fatiguing, and the ascent was so steep that conversation was discouraged. Indeed even if it were not for the inevitable shortness of breath, our grown-up pilgrims simply would not allow us to talk. Idle chatter was unseemly on such a quest.

Then all of a sudden when the woods began to seem interminable and the path too steep for goats and entirely invisible, the trees fell aside and you stood at the

entrance of a plateau, and the magnificent grey walls, wonderfully preserved, ruins though they are, loomed erect before you. The green monastery!

Oh, the glens in the forests of my beloved mountains, grown over with sweet smelling brackens, with darling wild flowers, of whose beauty one thinks with almost individual love; tall stalks of blue and purple campanula, very tall indeed, for in those days they were well over my head, and earlier in the season other flowers under foot, hardly visible in the grass, or springing out of the moist green moss, between the mighty gnarled roots of ancient trees: violets of every shade and size, and lilies of the valley, the two best incense burners of the woods. If the season is not too advanced you are likely to find in the vicinity of the monastery huge fruit trees in blossom, white and pink, and filling the clear mountain air with the penetrating, somewhat headachy aroma of bitter almonds. Pear trees and plum trees and a great variety of apricots, peaches and almonds, all blooming at the same time,—regular snow drifts of white and pink petals. All these are the remnants of orchards planted of yore and looked after by monks, who, in past years also erected the walls of the monastery and established their order.

Caucasus is also very rich in wild fruits. Besides apples and pears, which are merely smaller in size, but otherwise just like any other apples and pears all the world over, there is the alucha, a small round plum, bright orange in colour when ripe, and considered by us children a great delicacy whether ripe or not; also there are wild strawberries, blackberries in juicy clusters a foot long, and raspberries,—acres of raspberries, where you met "untold swarms" of bears, and where we did meet one small bear cub once, who took a dislike to us at first sight and ran away squealing. There are also nuts, enormous walnut trees and thick hazel bushes. There are small red currants and . . . Oh, but I must control

myself; the green monastery still waits for me on the flowering mountain shelf, where I left it more than a page ago.

As in all the ancient churches of that ancient land the walls of that green monastery were grey granite, adorned with the finest, most intricate carving in all cornices, ledges and arches. The Georgian cross itself is most ornamental, the four ends of it finished in a kind of leaf ornamentation. Naturally a church that was also a stronghold could not have very wide glazed windows, in fact the windows of the green monastery were mere slits in the octagonal pyramid. There are generally five cupolas, as in most Eastern churches, but from the borders of the Caspian Sea to Erzerum and Trebizond you see no Russian bulb-like cupolas, but always the sober grey tiled cones or octagonal pyramids. The entrance into the church, though the church itself be more or less large, also speaks of the double purpose it served in the past. It was not always high enough for a grown-up man to go through.

At a little distance from the church stood the belfry; whatever its cupola had been once, there was very little of it visible now, for a beautiful cherry tree sprang out of it and grew vigorously, reaching down its roots a long distance into mother earth. Once there also was an enclosure, now the broken down walls of it were nearly level with the ground, and the whole space between it and the church was strewn with *debris* of granite pillars, tomb crosses, and slabs, also worked in the same elaborate oriental pattern. At the entrance into the church there stood leaning against the wall a great big slab of granite on which the image of St. Nicholas, the miracle worker, was most carefully carved. However, tomb stones, carved sharp-edged *debris*, and fruit-bearing shrubs, everything was so tangled with creepers, so overgrown with tall grass and flowering plants that it truly was dangerous to venture alone for fear of burrows and

holes caused by sunken graves, into which your unaccustomed foot could slip so easily.

On reaching the plateau we always were in a hurry, overheated as we were, to get inside the cool, damp smelling darkness of the church. The glare of the sunlight had been so powerful outside that once inside the church we stood for a good many seconds with perfectly unseeing eyes. Then little by little we began to be able to see the light faintly streaming from above. Then ancient paintings, most of them only partly preserved, came out of the gloom, and stood before us as they had stood before so many hopeful, prayerful eyes. Most probably these images were the portraits originally painted from the Syrian Fathers themselves, who christianized the neighbourhood many centuries ago.

In spite of the ruin and decay, in spite of the water dripping in places from the walls, it certainly was a house of prayer. On certain occasions a priest, accompanied by his usual following of deacon and choir, officiated there, and the hesitating flames of wax tapers lit for the occasion made distant corners only the blacker. But whether the canonical prayer of the clergy could be obtained or not we knelt down on the cold moist slabs of granite and prayed all of us, the grown-up and the children. For none of us walked there merely to satisfy curiosity or the sense of the picturesque. Yet I remember very vividly the rather misgiving sense of being relieved when I stepped out back into the open sunshine and the fresh air, especially as I was aware that a small room to the left of the altar, probably a vestry in the olden days, was filled from floor to ceiling with human bones. My mother told us many a time that, as recently as her first years in the Caucasus when she was a little girl of twelve, there was a universal custom among the peasants of the aboriginal races and the Russian soldiery to pick up as a kind of penance the bones of those who died years ago in the woods, slain by ruthless Mussul-

mans, and to bring and deposit them in some such small room near the altar.

My sister and I boisterously ran to the spot where Jason was very busy. He did not go inside with us, staying under the great trees to prepare our meal, fetching water from the icy crystal spring, lighting a bonfire of aromatic fir-branches, spreading rugs he most likely had himself carried along up the hill for our comfort.

At the foot of that hill there was a *dukhan*, a kind of a cross between a primitive country inn and a miserable little shop, with a few fly-marked things for sale. Having escorted us down to that *dukhan*, where horses and carriages were waiting for us, and once more having attended to our comfort and seen us driven away, Jason turned monastery-wards. The grown-up people of our party told us that Jason would spend the night in solitary prayer kneeling down in the dark, or prostrating himself and smiting his breast with the palms of his hands Eastern fashion.

People brought up in different ways, opinions, and ideas may well ask, what did my early religious impressions amount to after all? A kindly old Georgian, ignorant, limited in ideas, inclined to religious ecstasies (or is it religious hysteria, people say nowadays?), perhaps not over clean in his attire. Then the miraculous! Miracle working undecayed remains! Holy images and holy places depending for fame on folk-lore, dried-up wells filling with living waters at the prayer of St. Shio; blackbirds turning white in fulfilment of St. Nina's dream. Was not all this but little above the level of exalted fairy tales? Perhaps, they are right.

But if, as has been said once in my presence, spooks are the fairies of the vulgar, the saint-lore may, in its turn, be the fairy tales of the too rational Christians.

Personally I think with tender gratitude and sincere reverence of the early Christian atmosphere in the moun-

tains of the Caucasus, which gave life and strength to my later beliefs. After all it proved an excellent foundation upon which to build a sturdy sense of the reality and power of God's invisible world.

Here I am, after all, oriental philosophies and German philosophs notwithstanding, a humble and sincere member of the Church of my childhood, prepared by good antecedents to occupy the position of translator for THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY.

II

IN GREAT RUSSIA

By Nadejda Brusilova.

A good many years ago circumstances of a purely personal character kept me a whole week alone in a Moscow hotel. I was physically unwell and morally distraught by uncertainty and anxiety. My long afternoons were enlivened only by my ringing for the maid and sending her to the office for mail. But there was no mail. Yet only a certain letter could decide for me whether to travel further or go back home. A friend was at death's door, hearing which I left home on an impulse but hesitated on the way and wrote, asking to be informed whether I should come. I knew it was my duty to be there. Of this there could be no doubt at all; the doubt was whether circumstances were not too strong for the performance of duty.

It had been a cruel and dreary week. One evening, long after dark, the maid knocked at the door. No, there was no letter yet, but a friend, a cousin, wished to see me.

"I take the early train to St. Sergei's monastery tomorrow," he said. "Won't you come with me?" Without hesitation I answered: "Yes, I shall go."

Next day, at an early hour, still dark in mid-winter,

we met in the Yaroslav Terminal. But when, toward nine, we approached Sergei's Possad, a village at the gate of the Monastery, everything was bathed in sun-light. I gazed breathless at all this historic, old-world beauty, the countless golden domes of the churches, the towers, the red and green painted roofs, the characteristic figures, pilgrims and monks, in the narrow streets, and then the big square at the very entrance to the monastery, everything powdered with white, sparkling snow that had fallen over-night.

We did first what all visitors do; we saw some of the magnificent churches within, the treasures of the vestiaries and the vaults, the monks' refectory. Then a special Te Deum was sung for us over the solid silver shrine of St. Sergius. It was my first view of the stately beauty of a truly Russian holy place. In this "Lavra" (monastic enclosure) there are holy images that were damaged by Tartar hordes, besieging the monastery. My attention was especially attracted by the "Wounded Nicolai," as the peasants call the icon. No one can look without interior shivers of awe and reverence at this ancient image of St. Nicholas, pierced below the left shoulder by some missile of the Tartars. This image was standing there when Prince Dmitri Donskoy prayed for victory over the besieging heathen hordes. The eyes of St. Sergei himself had rested on it many a time. The warrior ascetics Peresviet and Osliab, sent by their great Prior to reenforce Dmitri, had also prayed there, in the shelter of the "Wounded Nicolai." The past annals of our country, stormy and bright, passed like a panorama before my mind's eye in the very surroundings where so much had happened to enable Russia to be Russian. It is an exhilarating and at the same time a weird sensation. Praying becomes so easy, reverence so spontaneous. I left the spot reluctantly.

My companion had had the good taste to hire an ordinary peasant sleigh, with a rug-covered heap of hay by

way of a seat, and three swift and well-kept peasant's horses. I was quite charmed by it.

The temperature must have been very low, but we did not feel it in the dense pine forest. It was so windless that the slightest stir of the winter birds and of the red squirrels of whom there were great numbers in the trees above, swayed the branches very perceptibly, showering at times dry sand-like crystals of snow over our furs. These squirrels are quite a feature of this locality. At Bethany, a small monastery, where we stopped next, there is a little church where the altar stands in a cleverly contrived bit of artificial woods, skillfully covered with pines, firs and moss, with imitations of birds and small animals, hares, squirrels, fawns, grouped under them. This is the work of the "custari," a product of the home industry of Sergei's Possad, famous throughout Russia. The gentle and naive popular fancy, which created this altar was inspired by the numerous legends of the prelates and holy recluses, who had been followed by the little creatures of the wood as though they were the tamest domestic animals. The sun shone so brightly on the wintry landscape, the true perspective of a northern land. Oh, how beautiful it all was!

"I shall take you now to the Elder Varnàva," said my cousin. "We shall ask his blessing. Then you had better walk alone to Bethany—for I must have a long talk with him."

Elder Varnàva? O, yes. I remembered his name had often been spoken in my cousin's home. But, in the midst of the many preoccupations of the empty worldly life I led then, the name and what was connected with it had made but little impression on me.

When we called, Elder Varnàva was not in his cell, the door to which was never locked. But in the yard we came across another monk who said the Elder was cutting wood.

"Over there," said our informant, waving his hand in

the general direction of the forest. "Can't you hear his axe?"

We did, and it was just the rhythmical strokes of the axe that guided us. We soon saw him, a white haired, white faced old man, looking so frail and weak, cutting great heavy logs to pieces to burn in the monastery ovens and doing it with such unfailing regularity of powerful action that I could not suppress an exclamation of surprise. He wore the usual thick felt boots and stood almost up to his knees in the dry snow. The moment I saw him, even while I was quite distant from him, I felt as if my heart had stopped, with an indescribable and new emotion.

My first impression was that the countenance at which I timidly gazed was positively radiant, with a radiance such as I had never seen before. The drive through the woods had been longer than I had realized and colder. I was shivering with cold. But when I bent my head to receive this man's blessing I suddenly felt a delicious physical warmth steal all over me and a great serenity settle in my heart. I am sure that I had said nothing of my troubles. I did not expect or intend to do so, through all the long drive. Yet this is what I heard. "To-night there will be a letter, and let God's will be done. Do not fear, but if it ever happens that a friend dies unreconciled with you think of him on the day of the bright Resurrection of our Lord, think kindly and say: 'Christ has risen.' And after you have said that, both he and you will feel peace."

"Father Varnâva," said I, "why are we so unkind, so pitiless, so unjust to each other?"

"Do not judge. Bear with everything. And when Easter comes, remember all who have hurt you, even the criminals, the assassins, the traitor you know of, and think kindly and give them all the Easter greeting in your thought: 'Christ is risen.' This is what you should do. This is the good way."

I cannot tell how it happened. I know that I felt as I have never felt before. Something came over me which my mind or my experience could not account for. The great charity, the all-forgiving love, that shone in the kindly eyes and the smile on the white, wrinkled face worked beyond any doubt a change in me. It was as if he had gradually lifted off my soul, sorrow, the anger, the blindness of unbelief, the moral uncleanness,—everything that had tortured and depressed me.

He said: "Now go and say a prayer before the image of our Lady of Chernìgoff. My young friend here is impatient to have a talk with me."

I did go. Being strangely conscious that I was acting as if under hypnotic suggestion and smiling at myself, I walked out of the unfamiliar woods, found a path I never saw before, and, asking no questions, walked straight down a few steps and entered a small dark chapel in the basement of the monastery.

There, many wax tapers were burning before the image of the Virgin and peasant pilgrims were praying. A humble gathering, monotonously grey in color, with unkempt hair, with felt or birch bark covering for their tired feet, with heavy bundles on their backs. I was soon surrounded on all sides by them, joining in their prayer, kneeling when they knelt and making the sign of the cross on forehead, chest, shoulders, as they did. The simple and direct reverence of our peasants on such occasions invariably makes me feel ashamed of myself, of my egoistic schemes for personal happiness, for well being, for an easy and comfortable life. Their life is too monotonously, too uniformly unhappy, uneasy and uncomfortable.

On our way back to Moscow my cousin and I were both silent. After his talk with Father Varnàva he had evidently a good deal to think about. One more short winter day sank into the sea of many past days. But the impressions of this day remained. The effect of my

first meeting with the wonderful white-haired, bright-eyed Elder remains forever present with me.

As Father Varnàva told me, I found the long expected letter on my return to the hotel. God's will was done. My stricken friend lived two years more after this.

Many years fled by. We were dragging through the trying days of the battles of Mukden. For several months past we had known absolutely nothing of all our nearest and dearest, battling far away in the Far East. But however great and sincere my own anxiety, our old "nana's" was even worse. The dear old soul, who once upon a time, before 1861, had been the serf-by-law of our mother, but to her dying day was the willing slave of all of us, brothers and sisters, was nearly distracted with anxiety. Happening to be in Moscow for a while for my hospital work, I thought of the gentle, kindly influence of Father Varnàva and once more started on a pilgrimage to the Lavra of St. Sergei.

We found Father Varnàva in the upper church, in the midst of a great mass of people. I had hardly entered the church when I had the impression that for a second his eyes dwelt on me with kindly recognition. Pressing forward we stood quite near him at last. He put his hands on my shoulders and spoke cheerfully and clearly in a perfectly matter-of-course way:

"Brother is coming back. No harm will befall him."

And then gently pushing me aside, he spoke to my companion:

"You, white head, come now. I want to bless you also."

The whole thing had hardly lasted a minute. Out in the yard, "nana" and I looked at one another in a puzzled way and said together:

"Did you ask about brother?"

But no. Neither of us had spoken a word. Even had we wished to, we could not have spoken, so short were the few seconds we were near enough to speak.

It was an instance of thought reading. Thousands and millions of people throughout his long life had come to him for moral support, for consolation, and had obtained them. And in those days no miraculous power was needed to understand that most women's anxiety was concerning some one in Manchuria or Japan. But Father Varnàva did not speak in general; he did not say husband or son or father. He said, clearly, *brother*. My poor "nana" was both crying and laughing with the relief of it.

And true enough, in a year's time brother did come back and no harm had befallen him.

Elder Varnàva came of a peasant family. Monastic life and monastic attainment had attracted him since childhood. But owing to the unwillingness of his parents and many other circumstances he did not actually renounce the world till his mature years. He was thirty-five, when, in 1866, he finally took the vows. From the moment he entered the monastery his life became a model of true asceticism. He followed the austerest of rules, his food was next to nothing, he was never known to sleep more than three hours in the night. Yet he undertook and carried through labours shirked by men of far greater physical strength. Above all, he never isolated himself from humanity; his life belonged to others; his door was never locked, as his heart was never closed to anybody. Even after taking the vows, his life in most details was that of a good many peasants, and certainly in all details that of all monks. Having wrought great spiritual attainment for himself he was most accessible to all, never demanding perfection in others, never condemning. His enormous labour was all for the service of his neighbour. And the power granted to him, the quick sympathy and authority, the force of his prayer, became incomparable.

Beside my own two experiences, I know so many in-

stances when Father Varnàva's moral power worked simply miraculous changes in the lives of common, every-day sinful men, helping them in the bitter inner struggles, without which no victory over self is possible. No reproach, no scolding or even admonition was ever his weapon; such influence as he ever exercised had its place in the realm of unspoken moral righteousness and goodness.

Elder Varnàva feared publicity to such a degree that even his well balanced serenity was upset and he looked disconcerted and unhappy if people showed him some newspaper story about him. So not much was to be found about him in the papers, and city folk remained, comparatively speaking, ignorant of him. But the poor, the common grey masses of boundless Russia, knew him well and came to him, walking all the way from the most distant corners of the land. No one ever left his tiny cell without his blessing, which always meant moral relief and alleviation, and sometimes advice of the most practical kind. He met them all with the same cheerful, kindly welcome. There were no strangers for him. All his visitors were his friends, his children. And each of them, within his kindly influence felt, even as I did both times I saw him, that the relation was intimate and personal. Each of his visitors had the impression that the Elder smiled to him personally, that it was especially he whom the Elder wanted to help, to encourage and console. We were all his children and though his own life was the life of the spirit to no common degree, his bond with the every-day life, every-day pursuits and sorrows and interests, made them neither strange nor remote to him. He entered into all the details of the small affairs of small people and his advice, always sound, was sometimes shrewdly practical. And for many in the motley assemblage around him the only bright spot in an overburdened life was the intercourse with him, the only hope for relief lay in him. Volumes could be filled with

the stories of miraculous cures wrought by him, of hardened evil-doers repenting and leading a new life through the advice, or even through a silent prayer of the Elder Varnàva. The clearness of his foresight bordered on the prophetic gift; his unfeigned love for all was unlimited; the direct simplicity and purity of his faith knew no hesitation, striking and affecting all who came near him.

Father Varnàva died Feb. 17, 1906, while at prayer before the altar. The hieromonk with the snow-white hair and the bright eyes stood, concentrating his whole being in prayer, in preparation for a great sacrament. On the other side of the altar-screen, in the church, stood a great many people waiting for him to receive their confessions before giving them the holy communion of Lent. Silently and patiently they waited while at the altar a still greater mystery was taking place. The Elder knelt down and bowed before the throne of God, whom he had served so faithfully for so many years, his head actually resting on the altar. Outside his children waited in vain. For their Father Varnàva, their trusted friend, never came to them again in his earthly body. His bright soul had pierced his earthly body, soaring to the heavenly throne of the Most High.

All this, and much more, I learned on the occasion of my third, leave-taking visit to the Lavra of St. Sergei, before definitely going south. It was mid-summer, as bright a day as the one when I had first beheld Father Varnàva cutting wood in the sparkling snow. But except the bright sunshine and the deep blue sky everything was different. The trees of the forest rustled in gay summer fashion. The red squirrels chased each other in the branches, squealing and scolding. Innumerable birds made the air alive with their singing. We walked once more to Bethany, to the subterranean church with the image of the Holy Virgin; and on both sides of our rustic path stood the ripening, waving rye, bordered by such lusty masses of daisies, wild red pop-

pies, blue corn-flowers and forget-me-nots, as southerners have no idea of, in their quickly ripening, early harvested wheat fields.

The bright impressions which my three visits to the abode of Elder Varnàva left in me have more than a great and holy charm for me. In the past is the hope of the future. There is a Holy Russia because there were, there are and there will be holy Russians, unknown to outsiders, obscure and humble, but as serene, as unceasingly working for good as the luminous personality of him I have here described.

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

The Church and the World.

By J. K. Mozley, B.D.,
Fellow and Dean of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

The times which have come upon us make true thought on the subject of the relations between the Church and the world an urgent need. It is urgent for the world, since the Church is far too great a fact for the world to be able simply to ignore it; the world must react either towards it or away from it. But, in so far as the reaction is a thing of the mind and the will, and not of uninstructed feeling alone, it ought to be induced by a true knowledge of what the Church stands for, and what its presence means for the world. Criticism of the Church there must be, but the kind of criticism not rarely met with in the Press and in current literature, shrewd and pointed though it often may appear, lacks the higher values of a searching judgment. The critics may be kindly or hostile; but their frequent indifference to theology handicaps them when they come to deal with a Church which has no power to escape from theology ex-

cept by an act of suicide which would involve the triumph of those gates of Hades, which her Lord promised should not prevail against her. Contempt for theology is the worst starting-point in the criticism of a theological Church.

For the Church, clarity of outlook is still more essential. The peace and security of her inner life, the power and effectiveness of her testimony and of her missionary labours, depend upon the consciousness of an understanding of her vocation. That vocation is a vocation in the world and to the world. But a sense of vocation by itself is not adequate. There may be plenty of zeal and a scarcity of intelligence. In this case what is needed is not only a true self-knowledge, but a true knowledge of the world. If the image of the world present in the mind of the Church be a false image, she may run and labour in vain.

And further: among the greatest needs of the Church is the power to present a true Theodicy. She must lead men to realise that there is such a thing as the justification of God, that God has revealed Himself as righteous, and that we may know Him to be so. If God fulfils Himself in many ways, that is not only through process but through crisis. The progress of history shows God's judgment in history, but only to those who have the eyes of their understanding enlightened, so that the changes and chances of this mortal life cannot hinder them from the confession and adoration of a righteous God. The Church's office is to help men to that spiritual sight. But first she must see the world as it really is, and so grasp her relation to it. Theodicy is implicit in the first words of the Apostles' Creed. God is the Father of the world—so writers, contemporaneous with the origins of that Creed in the second century, taught—as well as of Christ. And neither the Church nor the world can understand those words, unless they understand themselves and their relations to one another.

I.

The Church and the world stand to one another as two ideas, two magnitudes, two organizations, representing a two-fold spirit and a two-fold tendency. The world is, primarily, humanity on its outer, uninterpreted side. God is the world's creator, but the world's relationship to God is not therefore settled. The New Testament conception of that relationship varies as God's intention for the world, passing beyond the act of creation, or the facts of experience, are in the foreground. On the one hand there is God's love for the world, His creature, so deep and moving that from it proceeded the perfect boon of His Son. In His first work He gives His labours; in His second He gives Himself in Christ. The cost and the glory are greater in re-creation than in creation. His first work places the world apart from Himself; His second brings it back to Himself again. Creation is explicitly physical, and moral only implicitly, by inference; reconciliation is explicitly moral, and its physical consequences, whatever they be, are remote. So, under this aspect, the world, even if it be conceived of as estranged from God and under an alien dominion, can hear God's voice and say "Amen" to it. The Spirit can bring the world to know the meaning of sin and righteousness and judgment. Thus the world is thought of as destined to receive God's greatest blessing—salvation. Deeply though it is (and this thought is always implicit) sunk in sin and misery, its future contains the assurance of freedom and glory; its sin is to be taken away. The angel's promise of One Who shall save His people from their sins is confirmed in the word, "I came not to judge the world, but to save the world," and is borne witness to in the testimony of Christian experience, "We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world."

Thus the world is viewed as the direct object of God's

love and redemptive activity; over it broods the hope of a final benediction. But, on the other hand, the world can be, and often is, spoken of as so radically in opposition to God that it appears as the very antithesis and contradiction of God. It has its own prince and god, the enemy of the Most High. It can neither recognise the Son, nor receive the Spirit. Its loves and its hates spring from no principle of spiritual discernment. Its interests and its attractiveness are a snare. Unlikeness to it is the goal to be aimed at, the avoidance of its friendship the one security. It is worthy neither of prayer nor love. It is the sphere in which the present triumph of evil is beheld.[1]

It is by the thought of the Church that these two so different conceptions of the world can be harmonized. Christian experience was, from the very first, of a mixed character. There was the manifold and almost overwhelming evil of a non-Christian, soon to be a consciously anti-Christian, environment. If the Christian stood for God, human society, the actual world, stood, in the whole order of its life, for moral and spiritual godlessness: it seemed to be organized against God. We may argue as to whether the shadow was as deep as the first Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, or the Apocalypse, makes it; but the question of the degree of its density was one hardly to be raised by those who walked in the midst of it. But experience had its other side; there was no doubt of the presence of the Spirit, of the reality of salvation. There was an answer, small but increasing, to God's love revealed in redemption. The light of faith was kindled from city to city. The world was not saved, but salvation was busy in the world. But those who were being saved were not thought of any longer as be-

[1]Compare such texts as St. John 3:16; 2 Cor. 5:19; St. John 16:8; 12:47; 1 St. John 4:14; St. John 1:29 with such texts as St. John 14:30; 2 Cor. 4:4; St. John 1:10; 14:17; 7:7; St. Matt. 13:22; 2 Tim. 4:10; Rom. 12:2; St. James 4:4; St. John 17:9; 1 St. John 2:15.

longing to the world, or as part of it. They were the Church. But the Church, in its increase, was the progressive realization of God's purpose for the world. It was the world experiencing, on however small a scale, its own conversion. The conversion could be thought of as from or out of the world; but it was also a conversion within the world. The two conceptions of the world thus vary, reflecting the difference between the world conformed to its old manner of life, its vain conversation inherited from former generations, and the world as destined for new blessings, involving in its desires and purposes a transformation which now begins to appear.

We must keep fast hold of the thought of God's holy love operative in redemption. "Herein is love . . . that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Love by itself secures feeling immediately, and purpose only as a corollary. But holy and atoning love is essentially purposeful. It is concerned with ends. Remembering this we can understand how, while we are not to love the world, yet God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son. We cannot bring the future into the present as God can. Our teleology is the hope, even the assurance of

> One far-off divine event
> To which the whole creation moves;

but the hope and the assurance are hard put to it to make themselves felt amid the pressure of the present. But for God, what we call future is as real and living as what we call present. Teleology for Him is neither hope nor assurance, but simply fact. So we may say that He loves the world not as it is, but as it shall be,—only to Him that future is not contingent but realised.

There is, then, no contradiction involved in the two strains of thought about the world which are to be found in the New Testament. The idea of the Church, and the

fact of its actual position in relation to its environment, and of its reaction upon that environment, supply the key. And in so far as we to-day conceive of Church and world as contrasted ideas, that can only be when we think of the world as not fulfilling the divine purpose, but as exhibiting again that hostility from which the Church suffered for nearly three hundred years, or when we think of the antithesis between the natural and the spiritual reproducing itself in the distinction of the Church from the world. But this is no final antithesis. The natural in itself is never bad; it becomes bad only when it is organized in such a way as to exclude the spirit; when no door opens from within to admit the Holy Spirit. It was neither self-complacency nor shortness of vision which compelled the early Christians, if not to frame in words, at least to suggest by implication, an antithesis between Church and world. The antithesis was forced upon them by the world. The Church saw the world, not as an honest inquirer but as a virulent persecutor. Yet even so, it was the world's abuse of power, and not the power itself, which was the foe. The principle of authority was of God. Christ had definitely asserted the rights of Caesar, and St. Paul was determined to plead before him. Nero's judgment-seat was an ordinance of God. The spiritual was hidden within the natural, even when the natural seemed furthest removed from it. Doubtless it was not always easy to remember this; denials of the redemption, the new wisdom, the new fellowship, the new hope, towards which the Spirit in the Church was calling the world, must have appeared at times as signs of an utter cleavage between Church and world, as proofs that if the world was to hold dominion in this age, the Church would triumph in the next, and that the two ages were, as the author of the homily which is called the second epistle of Clement, said, "two enemies". The eschatological hope was not merely the confidence in a good time coming: it was the verdict upon

a bad time present. It meant the assurance of the Kingdom, but despair of the world. Still, there was another angle of vision. The world may be passing away, its destruction be at hand; and yet its kingdoms are not simply obliterated, but changed, so that they become the Kingdom of God and of His Christ, while the glory and honour of their kings form part of the adornment of the new and perfect order symbolized in the new and perfect city. Even for the apocalyptist, judgment and salvation go hand-in-hand.

II.

When we think of the history of the Church, and of the relation between the Church and the world visible therein, we become conscious of two relevant facts. There is, firstly, the Christianization of those countries included within the boundaries of the old Roman Empire, and of considerable areas outside them. As what most people thought of, when they spoke of "the world", became Christian, any kind of a contrast between world and Church grew more difficult. Unity was more obvious than distinction; the Church touched secular life at countless points. The kingdoms of the world were, in outward form, tributary to the Kingdom of God.

But, unfortunately, conversion of inward spirit by no means kept pace with conversion of outward form. There were those to whom the Church seemed more depressed than the world elevated. This is what has been called the secularization of the Church. To counteract this we have the ascetic and monastic movements, and the rise and vigorous protests of Montanists, Donatists, Cathari and Lollards, and, later, after the great break in the sixteenth century, itself not uninfluenced by moral as well as by theological considerations, of Anabaptists and Puritans. Their crudities and exaggerations should not render us blind to the idealism present in their reaction from the past. They were one-sided and

unbalanced, often guilty of uncharitableness in speech and violence in action, but they were not ignoble or contemptible. Of all such movements the general theological result was the formation of the idea of an antithesis between the true spiritual Church and the world within and without the visible Church.[2] In the sixteenth century, the weight laid upon the absolute necessity and sole efficacy of grace led to a far harder view of the character of the merely natural. The natural was no longer incomplete, it was sinful. It was not neutral territory, but in the possession of the enemy of God. We see here, not a Gnostic or Manichaean metaphysic at work, positing "a naturalistic basis for moral distinctions",[3] but an insistence upon certain Biblical data. So prominence was given to the thought of the essential opposition between the Church and the world. This was strengthened by the growth of unquestionably anti-Christian ideas and influences. The contrast between Christianity and everything else was sharpened to an extreme. Modern Evangelicalism has been particularly thoroughgoing at this point. Natural virtues and liberal religion have been in its eyes a snare more insidious and deadly than open vice or aggressive unbelief. Salvation is to be found in neither; but whereas the latter fly their true colours, the former are a counterfeit of the truth, and so capable of deluding men and drawing them away from their only hope. But Evangelicalism has not stood alone in this respect; allowing for the fundamental difference as to the character of the Church and the means of salvation, the same distrust of, and warning against, what might be considered the virtues of the world, permeates such a book as *Lord of the World* by the late Monsignor Benson, as it does the writings of Sir Robert Anderson

[2]The tendency begins in Tertullian. He allows (*De Pudicitia* xxi) that the Church will forgive sins, but it is "the Church which is the spirit, through the spiritual man, not the Church the conclave of the bishops."

[3]H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 175.

or the oratory of a popular revivalist. It is a suggestive fact that both Monsignor Benson and Sir Robert Anderson set entirely on one side all thought of an Antichrist, who is a monster of visible wickedness. His especial blasphemy and godlessness consist, not in the fact that he is obviously evil, but in the specious appearance which he presents of being good. There is in this whole line of thought a tendency to depress the natural moral in the interests of the supernatural spiritual. Anything of a Pelagian type becomes almost the worst of heresies. That Pelagianism is one of the most pressing dangers besetting the natural man cannot be denied, but the safeguard against it is hardly to be found in that extreme reaction of theory which can be conveniently studied in Dr. Allin's *The Augustinian Revolution in Theology.*

III.

We live in a time of confusion and of mutual recrimination, so far as the relations of the Church and the world are concerned. Both Church and world seek for independence, passing into supremacy. The Press, which is the world's characteristic organ of self-expression, does not tire of pointing out the weaknesses and absurdities which it seems to discover in the Church; now and then it suggests remedies. Those who are least satisfied with the natural order as it exists, are often at the furthest remove from any wish to turn to the Church for help. Mr. Shaw is interested in the portraying of the true Christ, Mr. Wells in the discovery of the true God; neither has any interest whatever in the Church, except as an *objet pour rire.* The neglect of the Church is, indeed, a much more disquieting feature of the times than opposition to it.

The effect upon the Church is varied and not altogether healthy. We are familiar with a current of criticism of the Church from within the Church, which largely countersigns the criticisms from without, and adds the wounds

of exceedingly candid friends to those inflicted by the indifferent or the hostile. There is reason for thinking that this kind of criticism suffers from its impatience and exaggeration, and is, even if unconsciously, excessively influenced by the unfavourable opinions of the Church formed without her borders. These opinions, as we have seen, are largely misdirected, because based on ignorance of the Church's grounding and essential relevance. Such ignorance is natural enough in a world which has largely lost, be the fault whose it may, close contact with the Church. But the duplication of such criticisms from within is a much graver matter. The "failure of the Church" is by no means wholly due to her own unfaithfulness and timidity, to her reluctance to accept new knowledge and to reform her own methods. It is due partly, as it has always been, to the exigency of her Gospel. There are critics who write as though "restatement" were the Open Sesame of the present situation. Their earnestness and their zeal for true religion are not in question; their ability is, in particular instances, on the level of their enthusiasm. But they are not always careful lest, in their desire to make Christianity appeal to the modern mind, they present as Christianity something that is the reflection of their own minds rather than of the mind of the New Testament, which is the Mind of Christ mirrored and interpreted in the consciousness and the experience of His Apostles.

On the other hand, there comes from within the Church the call to emphasize once again the distinction between the Church and the world. Such was the tenor of Mr. Hobhouse's Bampton Lectures,[4] while elements in the teaching of Dr. Gore[5] and of Dr. Figgis point the same way. But here again is a danger. The Church has a responsibility, not only towards herself but towards the world. She cannot pass lightly by the doubts of men of

[4] *The Church and the World in Idea and in History.*
[5] See Chapter I in *The Religion of the Church.*

good will. She cannot accept the status of a self-centred, pietistic clique. Far from her must be the impious complacency for which the people that knoweth not the law is accursed. She is the keeper of the grand vision for the world as well as for herself. Only God knows how far, and in what way, that vision will be fulfilled, but she mush cherish it. She lives not for herself, but for God and His Gospel. She repudiated in the Gnostic controversy any interpretation of the Gospel which would restrict its range, and make it a secret for the select few. That conception of an aristocracy of believers, of an inner circle of devout worshippers, is not without its counterpart to-day. And the danger is the old danger of condescension and scarcely-veiled contempt—that is, of a grave offence against charity.

It is necessary that the Church should insist on her own supernatural character and supernatural life. It is life on a higher level, and all criticism and censure which start without any recognition of that fact suffer from an inherent deficiency. It is not therefore useless, but it can never be decisive. On the other hand, the Church is not called upon to deny the natural goodness and the natural religion which exist upon the lower level, the natural plane. The Church may adopt a phrase of the philosophers, and recognize degrees of reality in morals and in religion. The distinction which Dr. Du Bose draws between the "three aspects or stages of one and the same Gospel"[6] may be applied in a rather different connexion. There is real goodness in the world's natural morality, real truth in its natural religion. But it is not reality either at its deepest or at its widest. There is a shortening both of range and of penetration. Even what the world possesses the world cannot fully understand. It needs someone who can interpret.

This is part of the office of the Church. She is called on to speak of the meaning of the moral consciousness

[6] *The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. x.

and of the religious feeling which are the world's primary assets. It is for her to show how, in the Gospel, moral intuitions and religious impressions are co-ordinated and satisfied, how of all the natural goodness of things nothing is lost. Her Gospel of redemption means, not only the destruction of the anti-natural evil, but the salvation of the natural good for, and into, a profounder goodness. The object of her hope and work is the salvation of the world, the bringing of organized human society into true communion with God. That was the ideal both of medieval Christianity and of Puritanism on their best sides. Mr. Wells rightly includes in his new book[7] the aspiration for the advent of a theocracy, though one wonders whether his idea of God is, in any way, true enough to give reality to the aspiration. But for the Church it should be a real aspiration; through it would sound the grander ethical note, and she would present her claims and challenge in the magnificent lines:

> "'Tis not in mortals to command success;
> But we'll do more, Sempronius, we'll deserve it."

The danger of concentration within is the loss of the power to speak to the world. Yet here too we must take long views and allow for what may be temporarily expedient. Ultimately, the Church's vocation to the world might be better used if the Church, for a time, attended mainly to her own inner life. Church membership could be made more real and effective by a greater stress laid upon its responsibilities rather than upon its rights. Without anything like a policy of deliberate exclusion, it might be well if merely nominal attachment to the Church were discouraged. A man may be very unsatisfactory as a member of a Church to which he contributes nothing, and with which he is out of sympathy, while remaining a satisfactory member of the world, with the virtues of the lower level. But it is a matter not

[7] *God the Invisible King.*

capable of ready solution. All that one can say with confidence is that neither a confusion of the Church with the world, which does grievous wrong to the higher moral and spiritual values of which the Church is guardian, nor a sheer distinction of the Church from the world, which endangers the recollection of the good that is common to both and the possibility of healthy interaction, satisfies the requirements either of truth or of expediency.

IV.

But the last admission does not mean that we are left helpless. The exact character of the Church's relation to the world may be left undefined, and still her knowledge of what is needed in that relationship remains quite sufficient for security in her inner life, for effectiveness in her external testimony, and for the presentation of a Theodicy. This article may end with a brief treatment of each of these points.

First, as to the Church's inner life, in so far as that can be isolated and regarded apart. Through it all, in her dogmas, her institutions, her devotions, she is conscious, with a consciousness to be cherished, of her unique standing in the sight of God. In this respect, while in the world, she is not of it. Her members may know the secret of a hidden life; their experience includes the consciousness of the presence in their midst of the powers of the world to come. Her whole orientation is Godwards. She cannot submit her creed, her institutions, her prayers, to the judgment of the natural man. The standard of judgment is within her, not in the world. The world is no true *vis-à-vis*. Natural brilliance becomes a small thing as contrasted with the power to compare spiritual things with spiritual. In her growth towards perfect holiness, towards St. Paul's ideal of "a glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing", she may make countless mistakes. Yet only she

can find, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the means which lead to the end, since only she knows what it is that has made that end possible, and what the end holds in store. The uniqueness of the Church answers to the uniqueness of Christ. As that which sets Christ apart from men cannot be ignored, through the desire to bring Him near to men, without imperilling the special glory and power of the revelation of His Person and of the character of His work, so that which distinguishes the Church, which is His Body, from the world not yet incorporated into it cannot be minimized without a doubt being thrown on the value of the Church altogether. There are two great characteristics of the Church's inner life, the simplicity of the controlling idea, and the manifoldness of its embodiment. The idea is that of God's real presence and self-donation in Christ; it is expressed and worked out, and, as it were, brought home to men in theology and prayer and sacrament. The preservation of the simplicity and of the manifoldness is a duty which the Church cannot share; it is in the realization of her responsibility that there lies the true justification of such a document as the Athanasian Creed.

Then, secondly, along with her inner life goes her missionary witness and activity. Her movement towards the outer world is the necessary result of her standing before God. She listens that she may speak. Quietism in one sphere becomes activity and aggressiveness in the other. The sense of her uniqueness has not vanished; on the contrary, it alone allows her to testify as she does. That testimony is also a challenge; however much the Church avoids the attitude of self-conscious superiority, however humble she may be, as a prophet was humble, no less than a prophet must she come before the world speaking in the name of the Lord. Herein lies the possibility of much offence to be given, not only to the evil, but to those whose goodness is of nature rather than of

grace, who acknowledge the sanctity of Law, but have never passed beyond Law to Gospel and marked the fulfilment of Law in Christ. The Church must be willing to be a stumbling-block, if men will have it so: here, as in other matters, she is but the follower of her Lord. But in her witness there are σκάνδαλα to be avoided. If at times to-day, her children seem to humiliate themselves and her overmuch before the world, that has not been a characteristic fault. The arrogance of a debased Pharisaism has been the fault much more commonly attributed to her. The attitude of command, rather than of service, has been at once her danger, and the cause of much alienation. Her ideal, as it was St. Paul's, must be, by manifestation of the truth to commend herself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. The Church's appeal is to the world's conscience. Her apologetic is not to be found in denying that conscience, or in making little of it as compared with her own, but in showing that her conscience is the true complement of the other. She is the tutor and the leader, not the slave-driver.

The vision which Clement of Alexandria set forth in his *Pedagogus*, of Christ "as the Educator of the human race: the ever-present enlightener of its intelligence, the trainer of its capacity for virtue",[8] should be cherished by the Church as containing the *rôle* to which she should aspire. Not, of course, as though she were concerned only with illumination. The evil in the world goes too deep to yield to the very fullest revelation of the attractiveness of the good, which comes by way of teaching alone. Against the Greek idea that virtue is knowledge must be set the deeper insight and experience of St. Paul, that "the evil that I would not, that I do." The Cross, which is the Gospel's Holy of Holies, is the storehouse of grace first; it does not deliver all its truth to those whose burdens are rolled away at its foot. The Church proclaims

[8] Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity*, Vol. II, p. 459.

to the world the need of redemption, not only of illumination; but she cannot redeem, though she is herself redeemed. Her office is to guide the world to see not only its own noblest possibilities, but its deepest and most urgent wants. So she can become both the servant of God and the servant of the world. To God she offers the thanksgiving of a sacrifice founded upon His, a dedication of those powers which she owes to Him; to the world she offers the service of a consecrated life. It is because the Church has a unique vocation in the world, and is not to be confused with the world, that she can help the world.

And then, finally, there is Theodicy. Or, perhaps, it would be truer to say that while men would like to believe that there is such a thing, that the ways of God can be justified, there is anxiety and distress lest in looking for it they may start on a search to which there is no end. Now, while it might be rash to say that apart from the Church there could be no theodicy, the fact of the Church gives us the thought which can lead us on to certainty of it. The justification of God is to be sought for in history, in concrete experience, and not in abstract categories of thought. But history includes the Church. Indeed, Church history is not a mere department of European history but the greatest single controlling factor, while what the Church did for Europe she may do again for Africa and the Far East. But what is Church history? It is the working out of the tremendous simplicity of that fact which is the Gospel. Church history is the manifold working out of that fact in the face of the world, as Church theology and devotion is the working of it out in the sacred chambers of the Church's inner life. God's real presence and self-donation in Christ, which reached its climax in the Cross, is the key to Church history, as it is the act which made the Church. The Church exists to give effect, by continuous loyalty, to the work of God. But the object of that work was

not simply the creation of the Church, but the redemption of the world. The Church witnesses to no private God, interested in her welfare alone, and unconcerned with the unity of the human race. Nor does she witness to a God Who acts on history only through long, and not very successful, efforts to govern the course of this world in accordance with His Will. But she witnesses to a God Who has acted in such a manner as to secure that final moral victory, doubt as to which is of all horrors far the worst. The Cross is the sign of victory, and the Church is its fruit. Yet not the whole fruit, but the first-fruits.

In general, when we think of theodicy, we are over-speculative. We ask how the problem of evil is reconcilable with the goodness of God, how the war is compatible with a loving Father; if only we were clever enough, should we not discover the answer? That is, we do not look to the Gospel to see if theodicy is not established in its heart. It is established in the Cross, which is theodicy, because it is not tragedy. The acceptance of the Cross, the bearing of the Cross by the Son of God, made man, is the justification of God in act which we vainly seek in thought. If Christ could bear the Cross we, because we are His, can bear all things, just as God, Who spared not His own Son, will, with Him, freely give us all things, though every earthly ill should strive to be a barrier between us and Him. Not every doctrine of Christ and of His Cross will give us this theodicy; God is justified in the atoning work of the Eternal Son, Who drinks the cup, that from within the world He may hallow His Father's Name, and establish the world in a new and holy relationship to God. "The supreme theodicy is atonement."[9]

There is great difficulty in the justification of a God Who has always been above the battle and viewed it

[9]P. T. Forsyth, *The Justification of God*, p. 175. My debt to Dr. Forsyth, at this point, is great.

from afar, Who has never been touched by that fiercest of struggles which rages in the soul and throughout history, the struggle between good and evil. It is unmeaning to talk of the justification of a God Who is no more than a combatant in a struggle which swings undecided. But neither conception represents the God of the Church's faith. He is the God Who has descended into history, has brought the struggle to a crisis, and has won the victory. The haunting doubt whether He cares, and whether, if He cares, His power is equal to His goodwill, is laid to rest for those who see the triumph of the Cross.

The Church is the holy society, the object, not as existing, but as to exist, of God's holy, redeeming love, the medium of its present energy. He made it by purchasing it. But of that love the world is also the object. He loves it as His creature, and as a son who is to be brought home. He does not wait for its return, but goes to bring it back.

Whatever need there be to think of the Church in separation from, or even in opposition to, the world, we can never forget that each represents God's plan, that each exists for the working out of God's purposes, and that the end before each is the same, the fulfilment of both Church and world in the coming of the Kingdom. It is in the Kingdom that Church and world, so long existing side by side, and existing first for God, and then each for the other, are at last made one. For the Kingdom is the world finally reconciled, the Church completely holy, the perfection of all justification and all sanctification. And in the Kingdom humanity, changed from glory to glory, is seen as the spiritual society, answering to, though neither merged in nor equal to, that Divine Society, which is of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the Unity of the Godhead.

Dr. Döllinger and The Reunion of the Churches

By W. L. Bevan, Ph.D.

One of the great figures of religious thought in the nineteenth century, a master of historical learning, Dr. Döllinger may yet become hardly more than a venerable name. His biographer, Professor Friedrich, conscientious as he is, unfortunately had not the art of writing an adequate or interesting life of his hero. Too much space is given in the three volumes to the inconspicuous years of Döllinger's life, the quotations from the letters are far too scrappy and in the last volume too much attention is concentrated upon the Vatican Council and the personal bickerings originating from it. Lord Acton, another of Döllinger's students, wrote for the English Historical Review an appreciation of the great teacher's rôle in historical learning. The article is a fine specimen of Acton's powers as a writer; it gives a remarkable insight into Döllinger's achievements in erudition and the methods by which he attained his high place in historical research, but Acton's article is not concerned with ecclesiastical questions. Döllinger's own books and the references in Mr. Gladstone's correspondence give the best clue to his interest in Christian Reunion.

As early as 1845 it is recorded in a letter from Mr. Gladstone that Döllinger was interested in the question of the mutual relations of Roman Catholics and Anglicans. The English statesman gives a long account of a conversation he had with the Munich professor on various disputed doctrinal questions. The two men discussed such topics

as the invocation of saints, indulgences, and eucharistic doctrine. After a friendly talk Döllinger said to the younger man on parting with him, "Well, we are in one Church by water, upon that I shall rest." Gladstone replied, "It is my happiness if I may say so, to be allowed to go farther." In the years that followed, Döllinger himself went farther. He was undoubtedly moved by the alarming changes in the Italian peninsula after the date of Mr. Gladstone's visit to him, to take up at close quarters the question of a divided Christendom, its dangers and its possible return to unity and concord.

Döllinger once spoke feelingly to Acton of how his life represented a continuous elimination of prejudices, and this self-analysis is fully borne out by a study of his printed works. Neither the "Church History" nor the "History of the Reformation," despite the learning of both works, shows the impartial point of view, in detailed investigation and in generalization, that is found in his study of the Roman Church in the third century or in the volume of a more popular character published under the title: "The Church and the Churches."

In spite of the fact that this volume had an occasional origin, it was regarded by Döllinger as a work which could be made to appeal to a larger audience than that which had heard him deliver his two addresses on the Papal State at Munich. The demand that these lectures should be published by their author was met, not literally but with a conscientious preparation for printing them in book form characteristic of the scholar's method. Many months elapsed between the delivery of the lectures and their publication. During these months by way of an introduction Döllinger prepared a popular survey of Christianity, as it presented itself in his day, with a clear discussion of its historical foundation. He spoke somewhat regretfully of his undertaking in a letter to his friend Michelis saying, "I do not understand quite clearly whatever induced me really to get myself so

deeply involved in these burning coals which scorch the fingers of everyone who touches them. There are so many more harmless, more agreeable themes for me which I should have handled and which are in every respect more attractive, and now I must actually be dragged into this with bended neck." Naturally he was thinking of the shock produced on so many of his compatriots and co-religionists by his discussions of the temporal power of the papacy.

His own attitude toward the portion of the volume which would have a broader appeal is indicated in a letter written to Mr. Gladstone:

"The book which accompanies this, of whose existence you probably have already heard, I beg you to receive kindly in what concerns the second part. In the first part, the survey of the churches, perhaps the presentation of German conditions will have some interest for you. That I have correctly on the whole sketched the situation has been acknowledged to me orally and in writing, even by Protestants. Perhaps you will find, too, that what I have said in the preface regarding the mutual position of Catholics and Protestants will win your approval. I have gone far here in making concessions or, rather, I have gone farther than any well-known Catholic theologian of recent times. It is true most of this is concerned with German conditions. Perhaps I might wish that you would choose to skip the part of the book which deals with England, for, although I have written this part with all conscientiousness and as the result of many years' observation, yet I feel that I speak and judge exactly as a foreigner or as one who stands outside. He is alien in blood, in language and religion, the leader of your Upper House would say of me. On the other hand, I believe that the second part, which deals with the status of the Church, will not displease you, yet even in this question we are not in thorough agreement, for the hard phrase used by you when in parliament you broke your staff over Rome—'hopelessly incurable or incorrigible'—I cannot adopt. I hope rather, as I have declared in the book, the opposite."

This vexed question of the fate of the temporal power is now merely of historical interest. On the other hand, the portion of Döllinger's volume which deals with the religious conditions of a divided Christendom is of permanent value. It gives the reader a carefully considered account of the results produced among peoples of European stock by Christian divisions. It has a decided

personal interest too because here, as in so much else of Döllinger's work, one feels the impress of a passionately convinced personality, of a man who was open to new ideas, was willing to revise his conclusions, and who regarded as a first principle of scholarly work the obligation to be fairminded.

There can be no question that the work possessed more than a local appeal; that its arguments would be heeded by Protestants as well as Roman Catholics. Döllinger looked far beyond the immediate burning question of the temporal power, and in fact his discussion of the future of the States of the Church was directed to bring about an attitude of mutual understanding between the two great members of Western Christianity. He was especially hopeful of accomplishing something in this direction because he saw how on German ground Roman Catholics and Protestants had under modern conditions been able to live side by side under a common political system. It seemed clear to him that, if the Roman Church in the sixteenth century had been administered in the way it was administered in the nineteenth century, the religious revolution led by Luther would never have taken place; and here he found himself in agreement with Protestant authorities, who fully acknowledged the importance and the achievement of the counter-reformation in the sphere of social morality.

As to the prospects of an immediate union Döllinger was under no illusions. But he did see that some of the doctrinal mainstays of the traditional Protestant position had been given up. Doctrinally therefore Roman Catholics and Protestants had come nearer to each other. As to the future, the following passage gives his outline of the prospects of reunion as well as its necessary foundation.

"Upon the day when on both sides the conviction shall arise vivid and strong that Christ really desires the unity of His Church, that the division of Christendom, the multiplicity of Churches, is dis-

pleasing to God, that he who helps to prolong this situation must answer for it to the Lord; on that day four-fifths of the traditional polemics of Protestants against the Catholic Church will with one blow be cast aside like chaff and rubbish; for four-fifths of it consists of misunderstandings, logomachies and willful falsifications, or relates to personal and therefore accidental things which are utterly insignificant where only principles and dogmas are at stake."

"On that day also much will be changed on the Catholic side; thenceforward the personal character of Luther and of the reformers will be no more dragged forward in the pulpit. The clergy, mindful of the words 'destroy errors, love men', will ever conduct themselves toward the members of other churches in conformity with the rules of charity, and will therefore assume in all cases where there are no clear proofs to the contrary the 'bona fides' of opponents. They will never forget that no man is convinced and won over by bitter words and violent attacks; but that everyone is rather repelled by them. Warned by the words of the Epistle to the Romans XIV, 13 they will be more careful than heretofore to give to their separated brethren no scandal, no grounds of accusation against the Church. In popular instruction and in religious life they will accordingly make the great truths of religion the center of all their teachings; they will not treat secondary things in life and doctrine as though they were of the first importance; but on the contrary they will keep alive in the people the consciousness that such things are but means to an end and are only of inferior consequence and subsidiary value."

It will be recalled how in a preceding paragraph Döllinger thought modestly of the section of his book on religious conditions among English-speaking peoples. As a matter of fact the pages devoted to Great Britain and America are about seventy in all in a volume containing nearly five hundred. The defects of the Anglican Church are mercilessly reviewed. Some of his remarks bear out the self-criticism found in Döllinger's letter to Mr. Gladstone. There is plenty in the rest, however, that strikes home.

His readers are told how the Church of England is the Church of the privileged classes and how to what a small degree the needs of the religious psychologist of the working classes are regarded. Döllinger writes at a period before the beginning of labour legislation, and he speaks feelingly of the long hours of work and the apathy of the Church of England toward improving the condition of the workingman. The grimness and austerity of puritanism, too, is feelingly described.

"The Church is the house of the poor in which if it is anything more than a lecture room they feel themselves happy for this reason that they find there what is wanting in their confined and mostly cheerless homes. The adornment of pictures, symbols, ample space; the solemn influence of architectural beauty and proportion, tranquillity and silence, inspiring devotion, an atmosphere and the example of prayer. Protestantism has not only robbed the Churches it permitted to remain of every ornament, but it has even locked and bolted them up, so that during the week no one can pay a visit to the Church."

The Reformation is described as being on the whole a triumph of the rich over the poor and of money over the rights of labor. On the evils of private patronage Döllinger is not silent and he quotes from the London *Times* the following passage: "There is nothing to prevent anyone from going into the market and buying a living for any silly, fanatical, extravagant, or incapable booby of a son and installing him forthwith as the spiritual mediator between the Almighty and one or two thousand of His creatures."

Partisan differences in the Anglican Church also made an unpleasant impression upon Döllinger's mind and in his reference to the evangelical party he quotes with approval the words of an English writer who says the religion of many of its members seems to consist only of love for the Jews and hatred of the Papists. The picture presented is unredeemed by any contrast between light and shadow and on the basis of Döllinger's sketch one could hardly conceive how the changes for the better that have taken place since 1860 could have been produced.

America's religion is a much greater problem even than England's for an alien to understand. How Döllinger judged the possibilities and actualities of an American religion may be seen in the following passages:

"The state of Christianity in America is an awful and serious warning and will in future become still more so. The want of a peoples' Church which receives everyone in his infancy, incorporates him with itself by baptism, and draws him into one common life-giving atmosphere is a want that cannot be supplied by anything else. The condition which Europe would not like to realize for

herself she has transplanted to America, for America has become the rendezvous of all the sects and divisions of Protestant Europe."

America's trend to sectarianism strikes Döllinger as one of the most firmly established principles in the social mind of the country.

"Even the peace-loving Quakers," he says, "who continue united in England are in America split up into parties. It seems as if in this country of the freest political movement men found it indispensable to have their religious feelings compressed into the tightest possible sectarian stays, and as if they inhaled the spirit of religious dispute in the very air; scarcely has a germ of a congregation been formed among a body of new Protestant emigrants than they begin to wrangle and quarrel among themselves."

One of the characteristics of American religious life singled out is revivalism, and this is called a strictly logical application of the Protestant doctrine of Justification. Its popularity is due to the dullness and drabness of American life. People who devote themselves to business and money getting require from time to time some excitement. They seek it in religion if they can find it nowhere else, and the theatrical methods of conversion he regarded as being the result of the attachment of American Church members to their meagre, cold, Puritanical services. The bibliolatry of popular religion is not forgotten. Döllinger is impressed with the inability of sectarianism to produce men who are willing to devote themselves to the study of scientific theology.

One is left after reading these pages on the religion of the Anglo-Saxon peoples in a most depressing atmosphere. Somehow in some way the great teacher of history was out of touch with the encouraging aspects of English-speaking Christianity. His pessimistic anticipations have not been realized and in the course of enlarging life and experience many of the petty provincial features in American religion emphasized in Döllinger's survey have been abandoned, or made so subordinate that they would no longer stand out with the same prominence if one were undertaking today to do the work that came from the teacher's hand more than fifty years ago.

Perhaps it might be thought because of the generally unfavorable presentation of all peoples and organizations living outside the communion of the Roman See that sectarian prejudices after all are elements that cannot be repressed, even in the case of a man of profound learning and deep Christian principles. But Döllinger seemed to prefer to balance his depressing treatment of contemporary Protestantism by his chapters on the origin and development of the temporal power of the Papacy.

Döllinger's historical survey of the papal states has been superseded in its earlier part by Duchesne and Hartmann and in its later portion by Nielsen and De Cesare, but these later and more thorough works cannot diminish the respect for the frankness and courage shown by the eminent Roman Catholic leader in describing without reticence the evils of clerical government under the régime of the Roman curia. Nothing could be more severe than the description of the bureaucracy to whose tender mercies the subjects of the pope were exposed. The "opera bouffe" elements of papal rule are not omitted. Those who wish to know more of this rival of the government once handed over by the famous Duchess to Don Quixote's obedient servitor Sancho Panza must go to the pages of De Cesare and they should go to the Italian pages and not to the English translation which is sadly abbreviated; but even Döllinger, who was not generally noteworthy for a sense of humour, does not pass over what he calls the new and peculiar sort of punishment which was a part of the penal system of the papal province of Romagna.

This was the so-called "precetto politico." The person upon whom this punishment was imposed was compelled to reside in his birthplace; he must be in his own house by a certain hour in the morning; every fourteen days he must present himself before the police inspector, and every month go to confession and he must show by witnesses that the priest to whom he had been

at confession was a father confessor approved of by the police, and then every year he must make a spiritual retreat of three days in a monastery appointed for him by the bishop. Neglect of any one of these regulations became punishable by three years of compulsory labor.

The famous Achilli case in which Cardinal Newman became involved is mentioned also as characteristic of the peculiarly lax methods of justice prevailing under papal rule. Achilli, be it remembered, had become a Protestant in England and had lectured there to an open-mouthed credulous public on his experiences in the Roman communion. "He was a man," Döllinger tells his readers, "who had been charged with shameful crime such as in Germany would have assigned him to an infamous punishment in a convict prison; but having been arraigned before the ecclesiastical court in Rome he was there treated with an indulgence such as it would be impossible to meet with in any other country; and it also appeared that, despite the condemnation upon him by the Provincial of his order, he had been taken as an associate and attendant in visitations and was afterward made a professor in the college of Minerva at Rome and then sent as a preacher to Capua." In the years after Pius IX had become a convert from his early liberalism some of the weirdest schemes of oppression and paternalism were introduced; schemes that could only be paralleled by the restored monarch of the Kingdom of Piedmont and Sardinia who after the Congress of Vienna and the downfall of Napoleon compelled his subjects to wear the same styles that prevailed in Italy before the Revolution, and passed laws against the use of gas in the streets and houses of Turin, because under the old régime gas had not been invented and in the king's opinion distinctly promoted revolutionary tendencies.

Döllinger in great sobriety of language which his Munich audience must have thoroughly enjoyed, summarized an edict of the papal inquisitor Airaldi in which

under a threat of the severest censures he called for the denunciation of every ecclesiastical and religious offense that might be known by anyone to have been committed by others; he declared it to be the bounden duty of such to make certain sins known, as for instance a maid servant incurred excommunication and became liable to punishment if she neglected to inform the Inquisition of anyone in the house in which she lived having eaten meat on a Friday or a Saturday evening. It is not surprising that when the Papal Nuncio at Munich, Cardinal Chigi, read the book of the learned professor of Ecclesiastical History, he said with true Italian discretion that he liked the earlier part of the book much better than he did the later. Without the historical connection and the historical background Döllinger's concentration on the subject of the temporal power of the papacy appears to be misleading, because the positive achievements of Roman Catholic organization are passed over altogether. Nothing is said of the great capacity for recuperation shown by the Roman Church after the debilitating influences of the eighteenth century; nor is anything revealed of the striking process by which the sympathies of nascent democracies were won for religious work done on a large scale in the churches united with the Roman See.

The temporal power of the papacy was a heritage of the Congress of Vienna. It was part and parcel of the pro-Austrian system intended to defeat the movement towards Italian nationalism. In itself the temporal power was a relic of past conditions that had prevailed in Europe among all nationalities. It was not peculiar to the Italian peninsula nor was it the creation of the Italian religious sentiment. England had long known the temporal power of an ecclesiastical hierarchy in the palatinate of Durham. Germany had endured without complaint the temporal power of the great Rhineland Sees up to the time of the Napoleonic invasion. There was nothing unique in the temporal power of the papacy except in

its long survival and its conspicuousness due to the prominence of the ecclesiastical ruler on whom it depended.

No one could foresee in the early sixties how unsubstantial was the imperial shoddy fabric presided over by the third Napoleon, and though Döllinger had made a careful study of the prophetical figures in the Middle Ages it is no derogation to his own acumen that he did not realize in the early sixties how the whole structure of papal power would collapse like a house of cards as a result of the disastrous war entered on by France in 1870. Döllinger did speak of the situation as tragical and he seemed to fear the outbreak of an anti-Christian revolution in Italy. He also felt no strong objection to the possibility of the seat of the papal government being removed at least temporarily from the Italian peninsula.

Political liberalism in Döllinger's mind was an essential part of a movement which would act as a reconciler between the old religious system of Western Europe and the scattered fragments that had revolted from it in the sixteenth century. He seemed to feel the presence of a trend towards a reformed Catholicism with an international head such as he felt the papacy could alone supply. To reinforce his own conviction he quotes in his book the opinions of various German Protestant leaders. What he saw was the inevitable dissolution of the Church that came into existence through the work of Luther and he spoke of the clergy and theologians "standing like incompetent physicians by the sick bed of their Church." He quotes too the mystical phrases of certain North German authorities who found their sole hope in the expectation of a milennium. The words of the Prussian Minister of Public Worship are given as typical of the despair prevailing among German Protestants. "To the Apostles Peter and Paul who have each had their Churches for a time must that of John succeed; both Church and State must perish in their earthly forms that the Kingdom

of Christ may be set up over all nations; that the Bride of the Lamb, the perfect community, the new Jerusalem, may descend from Heaven."

Whatever may have been the hopes of the rank and file of the group who declined to accept the infallibility decree passed by the Vatican council there is little doubt that Döllinger, to whom they all looked up as their counsellor and leader, refused to be overconfident in regard to the future of a new schismatic movement. His position was a personal one, based upon historical study of a thorough and intensive character. It was a matter of conscience with him, because, in his attitude to the infallibility decree, he regarded the declaration passed by the majority of the assembled bishops as a direct violation of historical truth. There is every reason to believe that he was generous enough to see that hundreds of others who agreed with him in their opposition to papal infallibility would adopt other grounds of objection and would also adopt a course of action far less rigid than his own. At this period the great teacher had passed beyond the bounds of partisanship and prejudice. Many of the men whom he had educated and had come to look upon as his personal disciples he knew could and would not follow him and no pressure was put upon them from his side to induce them to take the step that had placed him in the condition of an excommunicated member of the Roman Church. Notably Lord Acton, a man extraordinarily sensitive to conscientious scruples and also extraordinarily attached to Döllinger remained within the communion of the Roman Church and preserved intact his friendship with his revered master and leader.

This aloofness on the part of Döllinger was naturally misunderstood. It was expected that he would, if he chose, become a nineteenth century Luther; but, as events showed, Döllinger's temperament was far more akin to the great Rotterdam scholar of the sixteenth century than to the passionate anti-papal champion who stirred

up public opinion in Germany in those marvellous pamphlets by which the world was introduced to a new type of religious propagandism. Cool and fair-minded though saddened and disheartened the intellectual leader of German Roman Catholics remained in an isolation which must have been peculiarly bitter to a man who to the full realized the spiritual advantages that flow from and through the life of a great corporate international communion with its manifold traditions, its inexhaustible records of growth, activity and achievement in the field of social religion.

There were abundant pamphlets produced in the early days of the Old Catholic movement; there was zealous and sustained controversy; there were bitter personal feelings; and that atmosphere of justifiable and unjustifiable charges and counter-charges which always accompanies the breaking up of old ecclesiastical affiliations and the attempt to organize the nucleus of a new religious group. Döllinger himself was too much of a historian to accept these phenomena of controversy as in any way representing normal and permanent standards of value in the religious life of the world about him. He took no satisfaction in the promotion of division among Christians, and it is most significant that when he made a popular appeal, and in doing so might have been expected to introduce largely into it the elements of his own recent personal experience as an opponent of the Vatican council, he followed an entirely different line of argument. Nothing certainly could be less polemical than the course of popular lectures delivered by him in Munich during the early part of 1872. Not many months had passed since the feverish and excited days when the Vatican Council had been holding its sessions, and yet in these lectures only a small place is given to a discussion of the results of the council and the influence of the council on the program of Christian reunion which occupies the central place in this volume.

The sturdy honesty of Döllinger's character made it impossible for him to present himself before the public in the rôle of a man who could ignore what had happened; who could put aside his unimportance, the failure of his own hopes, the decline of his own influence. He honestly faces the question which anyone might put to him in regard to the possibility of reconciling a program of reunion intended to embrace members of all the Christian Churches when the largest of them had taken a step of such a revolutionary character that the lecturer had become in the eyes of the large majority of the members of the Roman communion nothing better than a Protestant.

His whole explanation was frank and clear. It reflected the course of his historical studies, and whatever may be thought of Döllinger as a prophet there can only be one question in regard to the careful moderation as well as the judicious solidity of the words in which he undertakes to foreshadow the future trend of the Roman Catholic communion after the era of the Council. These pages present in calculatedly reserved language a picture of the progress and fortunes of the Jesuit order. It is not necessary to repeat the details of this examination. It is sufficient to quote the following passage as an evidence that Döllinger did not shirk the question or indulge in mere rhetoric when he came to consider it. For him as for the Italian liberal, Curci, the Vatican Council in its inception, its progress, and its final decree, was simply the product of the policy of the Jesuit order:

> "I do not only believe but know," he said, "that the reign of this order in Germany will not be of long duration; that their brilliant victory will at no distant future be converted into a defeat. I readily leave to this order the fate of the Vatican decree, the more readily as it has the duties of paternity to discharge towards them. For the Jesuits excogitated, sketched out, and finally shaped those decrees, though with the assistance of certain bishops."

Döllinger was confident that the history of the Jesuit order furnished him with the key to the future course of the Roman communion. It is yet too soon even to

analyze such evidence as might be at hand to substantiate these anticipations. One can readily understand, though, how time and again in the famous "Stimmen aus Maria Lach" articles appeared written by various members of the Jesuit order revealing the hostile feelings of the order toward the historian, who had never failed to place them in an unfavorable light.

One must look today at this question in a larger aspect, in the light of the infinite possibilities of experience and the manifold influences of Christian experiment. There is no reason to believe that a great and active band of men who have produced so many examples of Christian devotion and zeal cannot become active instruments in the great work of Christian restoration, a work which their popular training seems naturally to assign to them as leaders in any line of future Roman Catholic development towards general unity and concord.

As has been said the bulk of Döllinger's lectures present a cool and carefully balanced sketch of Church history in reference to the possibilities of bringing about a reunited Christendom. Sometimes one feels that the scholar's wealth of knowledge interferes with the main trend of his discussion. This criticism is not intended to suggest that the volume is not an admirable presentation. As a matter of fact it has fine qualities of popular historic treatment. Döllinger was a past master in the art of sketching effectively the significance of historical events and historical characters. His portraitures stand out clear and bold, and those who have read his volumes of collected addresses and studies are not likely to forget that he had the power of making an historical subject live before an audience which was without special historical training. In this respect it must be said that Döllinger was even superior to his contemporary, Ranke, but in the case of the Lectures on the Reunion of Churches one feels that the lecturer is more interested in the causes which brought about various historic schisms of

the Church than in drawing up a plan by which the schisms might be remedied.

Here again we are probably confronting the temperament of the historical student, though formally there is no acknowledgment in the book of the limitations which every historical student recognises is placed upon his discussions by the character of the subject. Döllinger knew perfectly well that professors of ecclesiastical history were not responsible for the various movements which had divided the Church. He probably realized too that professors of ecclesiastical history would not take the lead in directing movements by which the Churches would be united. The days of professorial reserve had not yet given way to a period when professors of all chairs and antecedents are quoted in the modern press with much the same kind of authority that the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages assigned to the writings of the Fathers and the decrees of the Papal See.

It is evident that Döllinger knew a great deal more—at least is willing to tell a great deal more, about the reasons which divide the Church than about the plans for bringing it together again. But as to the necessity of reunion, he is unhesitatingly definite and passionately in earnest. He gives no room in this volume to the common-places by which the evils of a divided Christendom are slurred over. There is nothing to suggest the apology which another learned Roman Catholic Church historian, Professor Funk, of Tübingen, offers for the reformation in general and the German reformation in particular, on the ground that religious divisions have promoted the growth of individual Christian virtues.

The apologists for division receive scant comfort at the hands of the lecturer. The claim that different nationalities have "*per se*" a natural right to cultivate religious differences is summarily rejected and it is rejected because of the strong conviction held by Döl-

linger, that only by united effort can the heathen world be brought under the sway of the Gospel. He points out how the principles of civilized life rest upon the basis of Christian Ethics, and also how these fundamental principles are not recognized either theoretically or practically in the non-Christian world, whether Buddhist, Brahminical or Mohammedan. There is no depreciation in his language of the heroism, self-sacrifice and energy shown in the attempts of a divided Christianity to evangelize the world. He selects as a telling point against current missionary methods the lack of a native priesthood, and calls attention to the decline of once flourishing Christian missions, such as those conducted by the Jesuit order in South America. The slow growth of missionary progress is ascribed to the divisions and sectarian spirit manifested in the missionary propagandism of contending churches. Various details in the mutual rivalry that arises from separated missionary organizations are referred to, and as the climax of shame the lecturer tells his audience how the holiest and most venerable of all places, the birthland of our faith where Christ taught, lived and suffered, is now the meeting place of churches that hate one another.

"Greeks, Russians, Latins, Armenians, Copts, Jacobites, Protestants of various sects, all have there their fortresses and intrenchments and are intent on making conquests with the rival churches. . . . Truly, every one who values the name of Christian should daily pray to God for a fresh outpouring of the spirit of unity that we may keep a new Pentecost of enlightenment, peace and brotherly love."

Happily since these lectures were delivered, the missionary work of all sections of Christendom has shown amazing vitality. Scientific administration is being introduced. Financial contributions have attained an aggregate undreamed of at the time when the lecturer was unable to foreshadow the overcoming of the obstacles he so vividly presented. Religious organizations, at home famous for their traditions of individualism, have adopted

in the mission field methods of direction and extension of a distinctly centralizing character.

It must be noted, too, how insensibly and gradually the mutual antagonism of rival missionaries has given place to mutual respect, mutual sympathy and mutual helpfulness. During these three years of warfare many of the hard pressed missions of the Roman Catholic Church in isolated areas have been supported by financial contributions collected from Protestant sources. The broad significance, however, of the position taken by Döllinger remains untouched and unaffected by recent changes, and to him must be given the credit of recognizing the vital import of co-operation in the mission field. In many regions of the non-Christian world there has come into being a tacit understanding among missionary workers that rivalry and proselytism must be abandoned, and that for the benefit of all concerned a zone system should be established if heathen converts are not to be subjected to enigmatic burdens at the very outset of their career in Christian membership. Much more in this direction can be done and undoubtedly will be done, but no one today would dare to underestimate the tremendous momentum that could be brought to bear on missionary progress by a real and effective program of reunion.

Owing to the large circle of readers who in England had become acquainted with Döllinger's lectures on reunion and also to the belief prevailing in the early days of the Old Catholic revolt that the German Roman Catholics might finally separate themselves from the Roman Communion, a conference was called at Bonn to take some practical steps toward carrying out the principles laid down by Döllinger in his lectures. The immediate reason for the Conference appears in a letter from Döllinger to Mr. Gladstone in 1874:

"On the one side," he says, "the Churches of the Oriental rite have been awakened to new life and have become drawn much

closer to Western Christianity. On the other side, in the West a great religious and ecclesiastical decomposition is taking place; and on the continent in Germany particularly, neither the Protestant nor the Roman Church in their present form can continue to endure for any considerable time."

At Bonn were drawn together in an informal way representative Anglicans from England and America and representative Eastern Churchman from Russia and Greece. Most of the German members were old Catholics; there were very few members of evangelical Churches, and no one connected with the Roman Communion, either lay or clerical, took part in the meeting.

"Reunion had always been a subject dear to Döllinger's heart," his close friend Professor Cornelius said, in speaking of his colleague's part in the Bonn Conference, "and all of its most intimate details were well known to him." Though he had now reached the advanced age of seventy-six the abbreviated report published by Reusch, one of Döllinger's disciples shows how in all the matters that came before the Conference Döllinger took a leading part. To the Greeks he certainly became as a Greek, for he not only quoted all of their authorities in the most intimate detail, but he showed a statesman-like readiness to meet them more than half way. In the technical theological discussions on the Trinity he agreed to introduce only Eastern authorities, and the deliberations were based upon extracts and quotations from the Greek Fathers. This attitude must have been especially appreciated by the members of the Eastern Churches who regard theological writers in Latin or any modern language as only half-trained amateurs. In this respect the Bonn Conference was very different from the Council of Florence, where most of the representatives of western Christianity indulged in arguments to maintain their dogmatic positions that were not understandable to those who breathed the air of Greek patristic literature.

Perhaps three-quarters of the pages in Professor Reusch's report contained the record of Döllinger's own

words. No one wished it differently proportioned, and he showed great skill in keeping the discussion from deviating into subordinate details. The debates were almost entirely concerned with the text of the Nicene Creed and of course specifically with the introduction of the Filioque clause. There was found to be really no difficulty or real divergence on this subject. A second matter of discussion was introduced by Döllinger himself on the agenda of the Conference, the question of Anglican Orders. Among the English members present this was a tender topic. One representative of the Anglican Church ingenuously deprecated its introduction as a subject of debate because, he said, all of the Anglicans present were absolutely certain of the validity of their own orders. There is no evidence to show in the report how this argument affected the members of the Eastern Church; they were too polite to say anything but they must have gone home wondering how it was that at Oxford and Cambridge where Aristotle's works are so carefully read, so little of his dialectical principles had penetrated the minds of his occidental admirers. Döllinger did not notice this objection, but he did proceed to give in a perspicuous form the history of Anglican Orders, remarking in the way of an "obiter dictum" that the orders of the Roman Church, if the "*porrectio instrumentorum*" were accepted as essential, must be decided to be more doubtful than the orders of the Anglican communion.

As to the significance and scope of the Bonn Conference its Chairman was under no illusion. In the conversation with Professor Friedrich, Dr. Döllinger remarked at the close of the Conference: "We theologians have done our part. Now the next thing is to see what attitude the Church authorities will take toward it. The one side does nothing because of habitual indolence; the other from political reasons." This analysis of the situation was entirely correct; there was no serious official attention paid to the discussions at the conference and Döllinger

himself, although the above remark showed him anything but optimistic, was a good deal disgusted when bishops belonging to the separated sections of Christianity came to him and always insisted on discussing the question as *private individuals*. He remarked, "they take my time and put endless questions to me, but they do nothing serious."

Mr. Gladstone in a letter written in 1874 gives a clear-cut description of the purpose of the conference to Döllinger:

> "You have not," he said, "if I am right, been fixing terms of communion among lay Christians, but considering the terms on which controversy may be adjusted or narrowed in accordance with scripture and Christian history. The measures of the two things are, I apprehend, totally distinct, and until corrected I shall rest with confidence in my own construction of the remarkable meetings at Bonn."

Mr. Gladstone hoped that the work of theological concilation begun at the conference would be continued in the future, and he made the practical suggestion that the propositions accepted at Bonn should be placed before weighty and competent men with the idea of securing their adhesion and their co-operation.

The subject disappears with characteristic obscurity in Friedrich's biography. Apparently a good deal was hoped from Archbishop Lycurgus of Cyprus. There is a long letter to him in Mr. Gladstone's correspondence in which various items of the Anglican position are explained. There is also a reference to him in another letter where his premature death is deplored and the hope is expressed that some Eastern Churchman will arise to carry on the work begun by the Archbishop.

In a general survey of the various experiments and suggestions tending to reunite Christianity, one cannot but be struck by the fact that the earlier programmes seem more close to obtaining practical results than the later. For example, Leibnitz used more effective methods for securing the co-operation of the leaders in a divided

Christianity in the seventeenth century than Döllinger was able to apply in the nineteenth. The difference in method was probably due not so much to the difference in the capacity or eminence of the two men, as to the different status attained by a continuously persisting divided Christendom.

All organized Christian churches in the nineteenth century have been more or less on the defensive and have concentrated their attention on the question of self-preservation. There is nothing especially heroic in this policy, but it also may be said that sectarianism and denominationalism have never tended toward organized heroism. Divided churches are essentially opportunist. They can produce clever arguments for adhering to past traditions, but they have not shown any special courage in facing the future. Experimentation is at a discount. No one today would look for the appearance of such a leader as St. Francis of Assisi. It would be a risky business for any ecclesiastical organization to allow a man of his temperament to be set in a place of responsibility or irresponsibility.

The churches of the present day are in the attitude of defendants, and perhaps this explains the reason why the direction of the church in all of its divisions is so much in the hands of lawyers. Lawyers are a class of men who give a feeling of security in difficult surroundings. Individuals who are worried about their material interests naturally appeal to lawyers, and the readiness with which the affairs of modern Christianity are placed under the control and guidance of lawyers almost suggests an approaching dissolution or a prospective bankruptcy. Energetic advance and legal leadership are hardly compatible terms. Lawyers are never willing to take chances. It is significant in the genesis of the Church that its Founder selected for his companions men who are always willing to take great chances,—fishermen.

With a reticence that was thoroughly characteristic

Döllinger, as far as one knows from his printed words, did not intimate what success a movement based upon a concordat of theologians would have in bringing about reunion. We do know from the considerable number of his published addresses on historical subjects that he was very far from thinking that to theological interest could be assigned a preponderating factor in national or individual life. As an historical scholar he knew the complexity of causes which brought about the religious revolution of the sixteenth century. No one quicker than he, the skilled teacher and investigator, would have agreed that Melanchthon's Augsburg Confession might have remained a pleasantly written academic document if Charles V. had not happened to have been a Hapsburg intent upon forcing on German princes the principles of absolutism applied in the Iberian Peninsula.

Theologians move with the stream but the stream itself, if it depended upon theologians, would probably be a mere trickle of water. Sometimes it might even dry up altogether. The way to make reunion popular is the way discovered by Luther to make the German reformation popular. After Luther had set up his theses on the door of Wittenberg Church people realized that something was in the air, and that something was going to be done. As a matter of fact a great many things were done. If Luther had contented himself with publishing a revised edition of the theses and then had retired to the Wartburg to write a long and learned book on topics suggested by the theses, the history of the last four centuries might have been as placid as the history of the Chinese Empire.

It is always easier to overturn an existing institution than to promote the work of reconstruction. Therefore it is vital to see that for the reconstruction of Christianity on the basis of reunion the driving power, which in the sixteenth century was unfortunately directed in a negative sense, shall now be used in a positive way for a positive end. Some of the exaggerated enthusiasm that so sur-

prises us in the language of the Reformation leaders, when we note what they claimed to do and what they actually did do, must be drawn out to give the momentum today to Christian co-operation.

The people as a whole are interested in the program of reunion, yet up to the present this program has been treated as only a field for specialists. To overcome the obstacles that lie in its way, reunion must be understood by the people. Its aims must be given a form in which Christians as a whole can see that they have a share. It really makes little difference how a movement is started so long as it is a movement and not a mere discussion. Long sustained interest can not be kept up by a discussion which revolves around certain fixed points. There was a vast amount of discussion in the fifteenth century on the methods and reasons for church reform. The actual movement took a novel and unanticipated direction. Something novel and unanticipated today is required to give the cause of reunion the energy demanded by its inherent moral position in the center of Christian effort.

The United Church of Canada.

By Herbert Kelly,
Central Theological College, Tokyo, Japan.

The United Church of Canada is a proposed, virtually accomplished, organic union of "the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches" in that country. It offers us a situation of the deepest interest as the first apparently successful attempt at reunion on a large scale between really diverse Protestant bodies.

The "Basis of Union" is occupied for the larger part with questions of Polity and organization, of great concern to its members. The Doctrinal Basis will, however, be of primary interest to everybody. How preachers are appointed is of less importance than what is being preached. And it is of special significance that this first great Protestant Reunion, so far from taking up an anti-dogmatic position, has laid down a very definitely doctrinal basis in twenty articles, of which four use the Credal form,—"We believe in—"; two commence,—"We acknowledge—". Fourteen use the dogmatic form,—"We believe that—".

I am not a Canadian, nor a member of the Churches concerned, but merely a priest of the Church of England, interested in the general question. My object throughout is not to criticize, but only to be quite sure of the meaning. If I suggest points which seem to me ambiguous, or different from the "Catholic" view, I do so in the hope that some competent person on behalf of the U. C. C. will explain to us what is meant and how far the difference is intentional. Possibly it may not be unhelpful for members of the U. C. C. to see what the

actual wording of their document does convey to one who has no other means of knowing what was intended.

On this last point I want my position clear. I know, or suppose myself to know more or less, the opinions of those who drew up this statement. All such knowledge, or mis-knowledge, I have resolutely put out of my mind. The document has been drawn up with evident care. I fully realize that it would be most unfair for me to start interpreting a document according to my notions of somebody's opinions. We have no right to ask members of the U. C. C. about their private opinions though we may ask them to explain the language of an official statement.

I use "Catholic" and "Protestant" throughout as convenient distinctions for two theological groups. I hope I may do so without offense. References in large Roman numerals are to the articles of the Basis.

SOURCES OF DOCTRINE.

1. Scripture. The Preamble affirms "belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the primary source and ultimate standard of Christian faith and life." Art. II receives the same Scriptures "as containing the only infallible rule of faith and life, a faithful record of God's gracious revelations, and as the sure witness to Christ." At the present day these are rather strong assertions.

(a) I suppose "rule of life" to mean moral rule. Nearly all modern writers seem to concur in regarding the moral teaching of the Old Testament as very imperfect. I suppose they would admit that it "contained" a true rule of life, in so far as you may construct one by selection. Thus in Ps. 109, vv. 20–27 are said to be very Christian; vv. 5–19 and 28, to be unchristian. But, after treating the book in this way, it is a little difficult to justify the word infallible.

(b) The Old Testament also contains many records of God's gracious revelations to Abraham, to Moses at the Burning Bush and at Sinai, to Joshua, and so through the Judges to Elijah. I believe that almost all modern critics are historically skeptical about these records.

The wording here seems to me a definite repudiation of all this modern critical view. Was that intended? If not, how were the phrases meant to be taken?

2. Tradition. The Preamble, if I might criticize, seems to me a little questionable. "Standard" is thoroughly sound, but I should have preferred to speak of the Holy Spirit, rather than the written page, as the "Source" of faith and life. The question is important in regard to "tradition." The Tridentine formulæ regard tradition as a co-ordinate authority with Scripture. Anglican writers commonly define a little further by making tradition the interpretative authority. To us, the recognition of "tradition" in some sense is theologically important, or even necessary. We feel that there must be some recognition of the continuous and progressive activity of the Holy Spirit in history, as well as of the formal and decisive activity in Scripture.

And it is very touching to notice that the Canadian formula also recognizes that human need cannot stop short with Scripture. Besides the "ultimate standard," it "acknowledges the teaching of the great Creeds," and "maintains its allegiance to the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation as set forth in common in the doctrinal standards" of the three Churches concerned.

This does seem to imply a recognition of the Catholic principle that the work of the Spirit is still a living power in the Church, though, except for the Creeds, it appears to limit that further leading to the Reformation Epoch, as recognized by three particular denominations. Did the U. C. C. quite mean to make that limitation? Would it have been impossible to find some assertion of allegiance to the Christianity of *all* ages?

3. The Articles give here a quite positive affirmation of the Holy Trinity,—(I) "three persons, of the same substance, equal in power and glory." The doctrine of the Divine Purpose, and of Creation (III, IV) are well and carefully stated. So also there is a positive assertion of the Virgin Birth (VII). The doctrine of the Atonement is stated thus,—"Jesus Christ offered Himself a perfect sacrifice on the cross, satisfied Divine justice and made propitiation for the sins of the whole world."

It is very important to be clear as to the exact force of these articles. Very many modern Protestants both in England and America would not, I believe, accept the very strong teaching about Scripture. I have known many young students who on theological or on critical grounds would not accept the Homo-ousion, nor the Virgin Birth. I imagine that many would not accept the phrase, "satisfied Divine justice." It appears from the later chapters on The Ministry (III, 2) that candidates are to be examined, and must satisfy the Conference, as to their "essential agreement" with the Statement of Doctrine. It seems clearly implied that those holding such "modern" critical views would not be ordained.

Further, Art. XV says,—"we acknowledge as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood (the one holy Catholic Church), every particular Church which professes this faith in Jesus Christ," etc. The Article itself contains no definition of faith in Jesus Christ. Am I right therefore in supposing that "this" faith means the faith stated in the Articles in general, and that the United Church of Canada would not acknowledge a Church which did not profess to believe in these essential but disputed articles about Christ and about Scripture?

4. So far, I think a Catholic would feel that the Articles were, if anything, a little ultra-orthodox (e.g. on Scripture

and "satisfaction"), but in regard to the Incarnation the Articles omit any reference to the "unity of Person." The point is to us of great moment.

Here are two propositions,—(a) Jesus Christ, in the Person of the Logos, took to Himself the whole Human Nature; (b) The eternal Logos became an individual man, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. By "unity of Person," the Catholic affirms the first, and rejects the second. Omitting the phrase, does the U. C. C. intend to leave the question open?

The very positive affirmation of the doctrine of the Atonement seems to imply the Catholic view, since, if Jesus be an individual man, one individual may teach or show other individuals the way of salvation. He cannot satisfy Divine justice or make propitiation for their sins.

The teaching on Revelation seems not equally clear. "God perfectly revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh" II,—would certainly suggest the Catholic view, since it seems impossible that a single, limited, human personality could be to all men a perfect revelation of God Himself. But in Art. VII Jesus Christ "has revealed the Father, by His Word and Spirit, making known the perfect will of God." The "Word of Jesus Christ" can only mean His "words," i.e., teaching, and words are a normal means for making known a will. This throws a little doubt back on Art. II. Does the perfect revelation of God Himself mean more than a perfect degree of prophecy as compared to an imperfect prophecy?

I do not want to argue the point, but only to explain a difficulty. "Catholics" cannot regard any articles as adequate which do not contain the phrase "in unity of Person," as well as "of one substance." The Canadian Articles do contain the latter. They do not contain the former, and, although I think they mean to assert the principle, it is not quite clear.

THE CHURCH.

5. Fundamental Church Principles. For convenience I divide this part of the subject into three sections according to three questions in which we Catholics are deeply concerned.

(a) Is membership of the Church an essential part of Christianity; or, is Christianity so much an affair of the individual soul that membership is a matter of indifference?

Many good people deny even the usefulness, and still more the necessity, of "ecclesiastical institutions." Some have even denied that Christ ever contemplated what is called "institutionalism."

Art. XV says,—"We receive it as the will of Christ that His Church should exist as a visible and sacred brotherhood, consisting of those who profess faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, and organized for . . ."

Are we right in taking these words as an express repudiation of individualist teaching, and as agreeing with us in affirming that those who profess to live as individual Christians without Church membership, even although they have "faith in Jesus Christ," are not in "obedience to the will of Christ"?

(b) Assuming the necessity of the Church, is there an appointed order and organization; or, are Christian men free to follow any order, or to organize themselves in any way which seems good to them?

Undoubtedly many people do assert this liberty of organization. I was under the impression that it was a keynote of Congregationalism. But Art. XVIII says of the Church,—"We believe that its worship, teaching, discipline and government should be administered according to the will of the Lord Jesus Christ by persons chosen, etc."

There is here a small ambiguity. The sentence might mean only,—"It is Christ's will that the administration

should be committed to persons chosen," but the obvious sense is that the whole worship, etc. should be administered in accordance with His will. So Arts. XVI and XVII treat the sacraments and ministry as instituted and appointed by Christ.

If I have interpreted the sentences rightly, they seem therefore to assert definitely that we are not free to follow a Church system of worship and so forth merely because we are accustomed to it, or because we think it suits us. We must look for that order and teaching which are in accordance with the will of Christ.

(c) The third fundamental question is this,—Are we to consider the Church as a Body already founded and constituted by Christ, to which therefore we adhere; or, is it a purpose only which it still remains for men to carry out?

The words of Art. XV,—"We receive it as the *will* of Christ that His Church on earth *should* exist as a visible brotherhood, organized, etc.," might imply that though Christ desired it and it ought to exist, it did not yet exist in fact.

On the other hand we find,—(VI) "God gave to His Son a people, an innumerable multitude, chosen in Christ;" (XV) "We acknowledge one holy, catholic Church, the innumerable company of saints, who being united by the Holy Spirit to Christ are one body in Him;" (XVIII) "Although the Church may contain unworthy persons and is liable to err, yet believers ought not lightly to separate themselves from its communion, but are to live in fellowship with their brethren."

These passages, taken together, dissolve any ambiguity. The Church is not something which can be, or is to be, constituted by a human agreeing or organizing. It is an already existing people, body or company of the chosen, who are already united and given to Christ. From this body or company no believer should lightly separate himself.

If, therefore, I have understood the words of the Articles rightly. the United Church of Canada is in entire agreement with the Catholic view as to the three fundamental principles of the Church, which I will sum up, partly in my own words, partly in theirs,—the quotations being marked by inverted commas. The words of the Articles seem so clear that it was hardly necessary to add anything of my own. I do so only to be sure that I have got the sense rightly, and to give others an opportunity of correcting me if I have misunderstood.

(i) It is not enough for Christian men to live as individual believers, since Jesus Christ requires of us obedience to His will, and "we receive it as the will of Christ that those who on earth believe in Him should belong to the one holy Catholic Church as a visible and sacred brotherhood." (XV)

(ii) The order of the Church does not depend upon, and may not be altered according to the preference and convenience of human judgment, since "the worship, teaching, discipline and government of the Church must be administered according to the will of Christ." (XVIII)

(iii) Nor is it possible for men to form Churches according to their own judgment, for there is but "one holy Catholic Church, a sacred brotherhood (XV), of those whom God has chosen in Christ (VI), and from its fellowship and communion no one ought lightly to separate himself." (XVIII)

But I should still like to ask, why is the word Apostolic omitted in the description of the Church, seeing it occurs in "the great Creeds."

6. Unity. The question of Unity is at all times full of difficulties. The ideal is, of course, quite simple. The difficulty of maintaining the practice of the ideal is also only too simple. The complex difficulty comes in maintaining the existence of the ideal. If two brothers, if man and wife, quarrel and separate, so long as the quarrel lasts, the family ideal lasts, although its fulfilment is

broken. If, to save quarrel, they acquiesce in separation, the very ideal is abandoned, even though in words they go on calling themselves a family. And in regard to unity, it may be my own fault, but I cannot see in what way the U. C. C. meets this difficulty.

The principle of unity is stated quite clearly. In XV there is "one holy catholic Church, . . . one body." And this principle is no mere ideal of words or feelings. It is recognized as an entirely practical principle to be carried out in fact and system. The Church, which is organized for certain stated purposes, which chooses and ordains ministers, whose worship is administered according to Christ's will, from which no one should lightly separate himself, is plainly a single body, which acts as one in every case.

The only hint of plurality appears in the last sentence of XV,—"We acknowledge as a part, more or less pure, of this universal brotherhood, every particular Church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him."

What is meant by a "particular" Church? Does it mean a "local" Church? England, Spain, Italy, Russia, are not Canada. In each place "Catholic" ideal sees one (particular) Church, acting as one, although in obedience to principles common to the whole Church.

So far the position is clear, and from the wording of the articles alone, I should not have hesitated to take "particular" in the sense of "local." But the Preamble speaks of the Presbyterian Church, the Congregational Union and the Methodist Church. This implies that by "particular" Churches, the articles do not mean only "local" Churches, but all organized Denominational Bodies, or, at least, all which profess "this" faith.

Here let me again define my position. From what I know of ecclesiastical affairs, I should have no hesitation in assuming that a "particular Church" meant a denomination, but I have nothing here to do with ecclesias-

tical affairs. I am concerned with a theological position, carefully drawn up and stated in this document. And at this point I find the consistency of its meaning difficult to follow.

For the moment we can put the "Catholic Church" on one side. The articles visualize for me a particular Church of Toronto, in the local sense distinct from the particular Churches of Winnipeg, Montreal and Quebec. Each of these is one body, one sacred brotherhood, organized, ordaining, administering, as one. If, however, particular Church is interpreted denominationally, then I do not see the meaning of the fundamental principles, which are otherwise so clear. In one place, in adjoining houses, the people chosen in Christ are not united by the Holy Spirit; they are not one body, but three, or perhaps more, organized, ordaining and administering separately and perhaps differently.

This makes the meaning of "one catholic Church" very obscure. The difference of places is no obstacle to a United Church of Canada, provided the Church is one in such places. But the United Church of Canada was only an aspiration till the denominational differences were got rid of. Similarly, if we think of the Church of Canada, England, Italy, Russia, as each one Church, there is no difficulty in thinking of the catholic unity of the whole. So far, however, as we recognize denominational Churches, so far catholic unity can be only a phrase. We like to talk of them as "the catholic Church," but they are not, and they cannot be, any more than the three denominations could be "the United Church of Canada."

Once more, this is not the place to argue the general question. I am explaining a perplexity, which I may summarize in two questions. Does "particular" Church mean "local" church, i.e. the whole body of Christians in each place organized and acting as one? If "particular" Church means "denominational" Church, as the

Preamble seems to imply, how is this denominational separation of organization reconciled with what is otherwise said and implied about the unity of the body?

SACRAMENTS.

A sacrament may be regarded in two ways. (a) It is an outward and visible sign (in the modern sense) of some spiritual grace given to us. (b) It is a means by which that grace is given and works. The first, (a), may be taken separately. The sacrament is a *mere* sign of a grace given or gained in some other way. On the other hand, (b), if the sacrament is a means, then it is also a sign.

The articles contain three statements of sacramental doctrine (XVI), one on sacraments in general, one on baptism, and one on the Lord's Supper. In each statement both principles are affirmed. *Sacraments* are (a) signs and seals of the covenant; (b) means of grace by which, working in us, Christ not only quickens, but also strengthens and comforts our faith.

Baptism (a) signifies and seals our union to Christ and participation in the blessings of the new covenant; (b) parents should expect that their children will receive the benefits which the sacrament is designed and fitted to convey.

The Lord's Supper. (a) Bread and wine are given and received in thankful remembrance of Christ and His sacrifice; (b) those who in faith receive the same, do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

7. Sacraments. It certainly appears quite clear from the initial statement, and still more from the detailed statement, that the United Church of Canada holds that the sacraments are actual and effective means of grace. But I do not feel that it is equally clear what these effects are. The only effect claimed for them in general

is that through them "Christ quickens, strengthens, comforts our *faith*." Does not this effect follow also from preaching, Bible-reading, hymn-singing, and many other pious practices? Many plead it as a justification for pilgrimages, religious pictures, rosaries, and almsgiving. How do these practices differ from sacraments? It is answered that the sacraments were "instituted by Christ to be of perpetual obligation." That is a difference of origin, but surely there must be also a difference in result, and the difference can hardly be only of degree, for degrees are matters of experience. If a man should say—"When I feel doubt, saying my rosary and gazing at a crucifix quickens my faith much more than the Lord's Supper"—I do not see how I could answer him. If he asked me why the Lord's Supper was made of perpetual obligation, and the other things not, from the articles what ought I to say?

It will be noticed that the detailed statements are rather more definite, though not entirely free from difficulties.

8. Baptism. The paragraph contains one positive clause:—"The benefits which baptism is intended and fitted to convey." Curiously enough, this clause occurs only in reference to children. I should have had no doubt that the words were meant to apply generally if it had not been that the same limitation seems to be repeated in the later chapters. "Members of the Church are those who, on a profession of their faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, have been received. The children of such persons and all baptized children are members." (Polity II, 11.) From the letter it would seem to follow that adults may be received on a "profession," without being baptized. The children of members become members by the mere fact of birth. Baptism is requisite only for the children of non-members.

If we look back to the Doctrinal Statement, Baptism is an obligation, and therefore a necessity of "obedience." But membership does not require obedience; it requires

only a "profession" of obedience. The difficulty is very practical. There are numbers of unbaptized people. Some of these will desire to join the U. C. C. Is any question asked about their baptism? Is there any clear authority to ask? We may refer them to the article on obligation and obedience. Suppose they reply,—"I do not agree with baptism being so necessary. You accept my profession, and I claim membership."

We must note further that there is no direct statement of what these benefits are, although indirectly there are three very important passages.

(a) The Preamble formally accepts the Nicene Creed ("great creeds of the ancient Church") which contains the clause, "I acknowledge one baptism[1] for the remission of sins."

(b) What is the precise force of the word "sealed"? Does it mean that our "union to Christ and participation etc." are actually conveyed or effected by it? That would be the natural meaning of the word, since a seal is what makes a document finally operative.

(c) If so, the passage falls into line with the remarkable article (IX) on Regeneration,—"whereby we are made new creatures in Christ by the Spirit, who imparts spiritual life, . . . using as the ordinary means the truths of His word and the ordinances of Divine appointment in ways agreeable to the nature of man." These "ordinances of Divine appointment" in IX are plainly the same as the "ordinances instituted by Christ" in XVI, i.e. the sacraments. And, in the special case I suppose it means baptism, for it is not easy to see how "regeneration, whereby we are made new creatures," could be attached to the Lord's Supper which belongs to the spiritually adult life.

Besides the gift of faith, explicitly alleged in XVI, the articles apparently imply, therefore, two other benefits

[1] Baptism is in the Creed given as an *object* of faith (cf. "I acknowledge") and not merely as *quickening* faith.

quite certainly, viz. "remission of sins" (Nicene Creed), and "regeneration,"—if "ordinances etc." has the same reference in the two articles (IX and XVI). Two other benefits, or effects, are implied less certainly, viz., "membership," since baptism is an obligation of obedience, and "union to Christ," if "seal" means what effects something, and not only what shows something.

Of these only the last is stated in XVI. Ought not the other benefits conveyed by baptism,—remission, regeneration and membership,—to be stated explicitly in XVI, instead of being scattered over different articles?

9. The Lord's Supper. The language here is much more definite. "Those who in faith receive the same (i.e. bread and wine) do, after a spiritual manner, partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ." That is, for the communicant there is an actual and real partaking of the body and blood of Christ through the bread and wine.

In regard to the Sacraments, therefore, I hope we can go at least this far in agreement, and here I have only drawn together different statements without adding anything of my own. The two doubtful points about baptism I have put in brackets.

(iv) The two sacraments are of Divine and perpetual obligation, being instituted by Christ as signs of the covenant ratified in His blood, and as the means of grace by which Christ works in us (XVI) and which are used by the Holy Spirit as the ordinary means for the imparting of spiritual life (IX).

(v) "Baptism is the sign and seal (that is, the means, of membership in the Church), of our union to Christ, participation in the blessings of the new covenant, remission of sins, and regeneration in Christ Jesus by the Spirit of God, which benefits the sacrament is designed and fitted to convey."

(vi) The Lord's Supper is the sacrament of communion with Christ, the bread and wine being given in thankful

remembrance of His sacrifice, and they who in faith receive the bread and wine do after a spiritual manner partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Of course I do not suggest that the sacramental principles of the Doctrinal Basis are, or are meant to be, identical with those held on the Catholic side, but only, as these three statements show, that there is an agreement up to a point, unsuspected perhaps on either side. I do not at present see that I have taken the words beyond their strict meaning, and we shall welcome the assurance that they express no more than is intended.

10. Sacramental worship. As a matter of fact, this important statement seems to me to imply much more advanced doctrine than I have given. Art. XVI (2) says, "those who in faith receive the same partake of the body and blood." Now faith is the attitude of a personal subject towards an object, and faith cannot be a cause of its object, since the very nature of faith requires that the object should already exist independently of the faith to which it gives rise. Thus, our propitiation is made by Jesus Christ, not by our own faith. We could not have faith in that propitiation, until it had been, once for all, made. "Those, therefore, who in faith receive the bread and wine," stretching out their hands, that in this special and sacramental manner they may "partake of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ," must believe that, in this special and sacramental manner, His body and blood are already present. And such a presence of Christ implies a special and sacramental worship.

I am very anxious to deal fairly, not only with words, but with those who use them, and here I may admit that the words seem to me to imply more than, I am afraid, was intended. Nevertheless, this inference in regard to eucharistic worship has, I understand, been drawn by certain Presbyterians in Scotland,—not of course from this document. I should like to ask what

would be the attitude of the U. C. C. towards that interpretation.

MINISTRY.

11. Ordination. Art. XVII deals with the ministry in four main clauses,—"Jesus Christ (a) has appointed (in the Church) a ministry of the word and sacraments, (b) and calls men to this ministry. (c) The Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, recognizes and chooses those whom He calls, (d) and should thereupon duly ordain them.

I am not sure that the relation between the "call" by Christ, the "choice" by the Church, and ordination are very clear, but the point is very complex and does not affect the matters we are mainly dealing with. Any organized Church must, and I think the subsequent chapters do, assume that ministry is constituted by ordination.

In any case, the question of ministry is one where differences are most likely to be found, and it is not possible to discuss them profitably until we have a clearer view of the denominational question. It is sufficient to note that the article makes no reference, and so far as I can see leaves no room, for the denominational view. There is a single Church, for which the Lord has appointed a single ministry, and the Church accordingly chooses men for that ministry and ordains them, "according to Christ's will" (XVIII). However, I think we may add this,—

(vii) "Jesus Christ has appointed in the Church a ministry of the word and sacraments." No man can admit himself to that ministry, nor may any group of men constitute a ministry for themselves, since it belongs to "the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to choose and ordain men to the work of the ministry."

12. Authority. "The worship, teaching, discipline, and government of the Church should (must?) be ad-

ministered according to Christ's will by persons chosen for their fitness and duly set apart to their office." (XVIII)

This, I think, we should accept as it stands, as our eighth formula of agreement, though I am still uncertain whether its intention is quite at one with its wording. By a single administration of worship, government, etc., by a single Church, under a single principle of obedience to Christ's will, does the U. C. C. really intend to repudiate denominational difference?

There is, however, a special perplexity. Who are the persons chosen and set apart for this administration? I should have assumed without question that it meant the ministry, but the chapters on Polity make it clear that the administration of discipline and government is in the hands of various bodies from "sessions" up to the General Council. In these bodies at least half are "non-ministerial" representatives. And these bodies oversee and legislate about worship and doctrine also.

The non-ministerial members are "chosen," but, as laymen, how are they "set apart"?

In our working life, there are so many beliefs we take for granted or lose sight of, that the result of any attempt at a complete doctrinal statement is bound to be a surprise to ourselves and others. In this case, the co-operation of other bodies is invited and that invitation justifies a little friendly criticism.

This body of articles has one advantage over the Thirty-Nine or any similar body I can remember, in that it is wholly positive. No other beliefs, or mis-beliefs, are condemned or censured even implicitly, except those which are themselves negative,—as the assertion of the necessity of the Church or of sacraments, unavoidably condemns those who deny the necessity. On the other hand, there is nothing in all these articles to prevent a man holding Episcopacy, Apostolic Succession, Transubstantiation, worship of Saints, or the Papacy, to be true and necessary beliefs.

As a "Catholic" one may think, must think, the statement does not go far enough. I have not done more than hint at some points omitted which are to us indispensable. But as one studies the document one is much more astonished to see how far it does go in a Catholic direction. And even when it stops, it stops with an air of uncertainty like a man who has laid down premises and then shrinks from drawing the conclusion, as if conscious that it ought to go further, and not quite sure why it does not. One can only hope that in the U. C. C. it will be taken seriously, for, when a position has once been formulated as a whole, there is a real danger that men, instead of following where it leads, may fall back on the old instinctive half truths from which it should have saved them.

The United Lutheran Church in America

By Henry Eyster Jacobs, D.D., LL.D.,
Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

We write in the confidence that whatever progress may be made in promoting the organic union of the various branches of any of the Christian denominations must be a matter of interest to advocates of Church Union on a wider basis. Certainly when any Church communion has reconciled the differences within itself, it will be in a better situation to confer seriously concerning adjusting its relations with other communions. Of the non-Roman communions in America, the Lutheran Church, with a communicant membership of two and a half millions, representing probably nearly three times as large a population, claims to be third. With less appreciation of its inner unity than the late Dr. T. M. Lindsay of the United Free Church of Scotland — who in the Encyclopedia Britannica (Eleventh edition, Vol. 17, p. 141) speaks of "the great American Lutheran Church" — a very intelligent and sober Church statistician has been insisting for nearly a quarter of a century that there are no less than seventeen distinct Lutheran denominations. While among Lutherans themselves, this statement has met with a general protest, nevertheless it is realized that the best way to remove such misunderstanding, is to remove as far as possible the grounds upon which it is based. It is for this reason that unanimous action taken, June 22nd, in the convention of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United

States, at Chicago, in the presence and with the active sympathy of representative commissions from both the General Council and the United Synod of the South, is particularly gratifying.

The three Bodies whose coalition seems to be foreshadowed by this action represent less numerically than they do historically. Numerically they comprise over one-third of the communicant membership; but historically, they include the congregations and synods that are most closely related to the organizing activity of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, and whose entire development has been determined by the outgrowth of the principles for which he stood. It is that portion of the Lutheran Church that has had the longest experience in maintaining its existence under American conditions, and is most thoroughly anglicized in language and americanized in spirit. Of these synods, the oldest are The Ministerium of Pennsylvania founded in 1748, and The Ministerium of New York in 1776, the former by Dr. Muhlenberg himself, and the latter by his son, Frederick Augustus, afterwards the first Speaker of the National House of Representatives. Both of these belong to the General Council; while the synods of the General Synod represent very largely the influence of the institutions at Gettysburg and their offshoots in educational and home missionary activity. The Swedish Augustana synod, belonging to the General Council, has congregations in almost every State in the Union and has maintained its solidarity by drawing its pastors from a single theological school at Rock Island, Illinois. The United Synod of the South is composed almost exclusively of descendants of immigrants of the Colonial period.

The Mother Synod, now the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, as founded by Muhlenberg, was composed of both Germans and Swedes, and in its first Constitution ignored all nationalistic, linguistic and territorial limitations short of the Gulf of Mexico, when it styled itself

"The Ministerium of the Lutheran Church in North America." As the Church expanded into more distant territory the ideal of a single synod for the continent was found impracticable, and the formation of the synods of New York, North Carolina, Ohio, etc. made her realize that she should be content with the more densely settled portions of Pennsylvania. But lest such separation, in order to administer more successfully local affairs, might degenerate into a narrow provincialism, attempts were made, at the time of the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the Reformation in 1817, to unite the separated synods into a general Body, which resulted in the General Synod in 1820. Withdrawing from the General Synod in 1823, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania reunited with it in 1853, and as the result of a violent controversy concerning the confessional basis was separated again from it in 1866. The influence upon the General Synod of the prevalent religious life of the country and especially of the introduction of revivalistic practices, was believed to imperil fidelity to Lutheran principles. Meanwhile there had been a marvelous growth of churches of a more confessional character throughout the country, due partly to immigration and partly to more conservative influences in the educational centers. The Ministerium of Pennsylvania determined, under these circumstances, to make a second effort to organize a General Body, so as to unite if possible all Lutheran Synods in America upon an unequivocal confessional basis. This resulted in the General Council, organized in 1867, composed partly of synods that left the General Synod, and of a number of synods in the Middle West that had never belonged to it.

The United Synod of the South comprises the Lutheran elements of the Muhlenberg type that were isolated from their Northern brethren during the Civil War, and which, since the reconciliation between the North and the South, have maintained a separate existence, in part

because of strong Southern feeling, but probably still more because no union with either of the Northern Bodies was possible without extending into the South the line of cleavage which has separated the churches in the North. Its pastors have been educated, some in the seminaries of the General Council, and others in those of the General Synod, while, in recent years, its own seminary at Columbia, S. C., has shown increasing vigour. Both General Synod and General Council men are in pastorates of Southern churches, and men from the South are serving congregations of both the Northern Bodies. The isolation of the South has thus been a unifying measure, as the United Synod has been a bond and an arbiter between its two associates.

When in 1866, the break in the General Synod occurred, it seemed to be one that was destined to be irreparable. Every appearance indicated that the two sections would drift far apart. But it soon became manifest that the General Council, while exerting a powerful influenec throughout the entire Church, would not be able to bring within itself a very large proportion of the most conservative and rigidly confessional elements in the West, composed chiefly of the more recent immigrants from Germany. While generally one in regard to principles involved in questions under discussion, the older synods in the East which had formed the General Council were not able to satisfy the western synods with their application to practice. As a result these synods either stood aloof, or, after a brief connection with the Council, withdrew, and formed the Synodical Conference, of which the Synod of Missouri has always been the dominant factor. The General Council turned then to more constructive work, devoting its strength to the foundation and establishment of educational institutions, the cultivation of Foreign Missions in India and Japan, the development of Home Missions with a view particularly to the future of the Church as an English speaking Body,

the introduction of Inner Missions, the production of an English literature, devoted to the defence and exposition of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church as set forth in the Confessions, and to the proper regulation of the worship of the Church on historical and liturgical lines.

As the heat of controversy abated, the General Synod showed a growing appreciation of Lutheran doctrine and a constantly increasing consistency with Lutheran practice. Whatever contradictions might be found in individual cases, the General Council had laid it down as one of its Fundamental Principles that synods must in all cases be judged by the official record, and that, within a general organization, the synods could deal only with synods and not with individuals. Even when the controversy was most acute, viz. at the York convention in 1864, a revision of the doctrinal basis was recommended to the District Synods, and was promptly adopted, which marked a great advance upon what had previously prevailed. All through the years that have followed a silent constructive process has been gradually promoting inner unity with the more conservative portion of the Church. In 1873, the General Synod proposed an exchange of official visitors with the General Council, to which the latter answered by inviting all Lutheran Bodies in America to a "Colloquium," in which to discuss frankly and endeavor to adjust their differences. Although it was found that the Church was not yet ready officially to endorse this project, the suggestion was unofficially carried out in the two "Lutheran Diets" of 1877-8, arranged for by the venerable Dr. J. G. Morris of Baltimore and Dr. J. A. Seiss of Philadelphia, the former a leader of the General Synod, and the latter of the General Council. In these Church congresses, representatives of both Bodies as well as of the Southern Church, read carefully prepared papers which were freely discussed, and showed that it was possible to review real and imaginary points of difference in a calm

and dispassionate manner. The general effect of these two public conferences, which was rendered more permanent by the publication of the proceedings in book form, was to remove many misconceptions and prejudices. They inspired mutual respect and a higher appreciation of each others' position. But the embers of the former controversy slumbered beneath the surface, and it was soon found how ready they were to be fanned into flame.

The next movement bore more permanent fruit. The Southern Church in 1879 proposed to the two Northern Bodies that they should join with it in the preparation and publication of a Common Book of Worship. As a very large proportion of the General Synod had manifested for many years a very active and pronounced antagonism to liturgical forms, this proposal was regarded at first as scarcely more than a devout wish whose attainment was entirely impracticable. The General Council, however, received it in good faith and laid down certain principles in accordance with which it was ready to cooperate. The consensus of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century was made the standard according to which the liturgy should be prepared. This condition being promptly ratified by the other Bodies a Joint Committee, after several years' labour, reported "The Common Service for the use of Evangelical Lutheran Congregations" which was published in 1887. The undertaking, as it progressed, was found to have meaning and scope far beyond what any one had imagined at its beginning. The close study of the liturgical material of the Reformation Orders led to a richer and more accurate appreciation of the nature of the liturgical reforms made by Luther and his collaborators. The historical sense and conservative spirit of the classical models were traced. The committee, and after them all who were disposed to follow them in their work, were led to the study of the originals of which the Lutheran liturgies

were only revisions, and thus were carried back to the treasures of the Ancient Church, and were able, in many cases, to continue the work which Luther had left incomplete, while always guided by the principles which had guided him. When finished they were able as far as it went to recommend the "Common Service" as not simply an order which could justly be called Lutheran, but as actually the historical order of the Christian Church, as it had been developed in the historical Church throughout its entire course. Thus almost unconsciously the three Bodies were led to a review of the doctrinal questions which, it was thought, had separated them; since these questions were involved at every stage of their liturgical work, in accordance with the adage of Augustine, "*Lex supplicandi est lex credendi.*" But since, on all points of principle, there was entire unanimity, it was an indication that the breach was not as serious as it had seemed. This judgment was confirmed by the warm welcome accorded the completed work and the manner in which from year to year it overcame opposition and the riches of its contents were unfolded. It was accepted also by other Lutheran Bodies that had not co-operated in its preparation, and is used in the Synodical Conference as well as in the General Synod, General Council and United Synod South. The Missourians and Joint Synod of Ohio met with the Joint Committee in the preparation of translations of Luther's Small Catechism, and the Augsburg Confession.

There was a crying demand that this work should be continued by the preparation of similar common orders for Ministerial Acts, such as Baptism, Confirmation, Ordination, Marriage and Burial, and by a Hymnal constructed in the same spirit, as the hymnal common not only to the Lutheran Church, but also to our common Christianity. For over twenty years, with many discouragements, and with the loss by death of some of its most active members, the Joint Committee toiled over

this task, until absolute unanimity was attained in "The Common Service Book and Hymnal," which will appear this autumn.

In 1893, the General Synod proposed that a commission on Practical Co-operation should be appointed; the result of which was the adoption of measures to prevent the synods and congregations of the separated Bodies from interfering with the work of one another, and to promote the observance of geographical lines in the conduct of Home Missions. Another outcome of this commission was the convening of three General Conferences, two in Philadelphia in 1899 and 1902, and one in Pittsburgh in 1904, in which, as in the Diets of 1877-8, doctrinal and practical questions were discussed. In the exchange of Official Visitors, begun in 1895, and in all other relations with the General Synod, the General Council acted with great caution, instructing its representatives to be guided throughout by its Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity. When in 1909, it was asked by one of its District Synods to define the difference between its doctrinal basis and that of the General Synod, it gave the official reply that "the basis of the General Synod, so far as the words are concerned, is a less completely developed form of the same confessional basis as that of the General Council." As a matter of fact, the same hand wrote both statements, as Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth was the author of the two formulas. The Council at the same time insisted upon the need of an ampler formula, in order to guard against ambiguities, of which errorists might readily, although unfairly, take advantage. The attention of the General Synod having been called to this criticism, at its convention in 1911, it proceeded at once to take measures to guard more carefully its statements, which were announced in 1913, as completed in a formula of subscription approximating that of the General Council still more closely. These details are recounted in order to show

that the action which has been just proposed is not one which has been suddenly brought about, but is the outcome of efforts that have been in progress for many years.

As old antagonisms disappeared, practical cooperation began spontaneously, as those charged with important interests turned towards those of the same name and historical antecedents who were recognized as holding to the same faith and as working for the same end. The earliest movement of this character was probably the organization of the various Deaconess Boards into an association which for many years has been meeting annually, a movement which was begun by some of the most conservative representatives of the Church. A wider movement was that which concerned the work of Foreign Missions. The missionaries of the General Synod and the General Council on contiguous fields among the Telegus in southern India formed a conference, and later succeeded in bringing nearly all the Lutheran fields in India into "The All India Lutheran Conference", an association which has been of great importance to the German Missions under the stress of present war conditions. At the invitation of the United Synod South, the Council established a mission in Japan to strengthen the work of their southern brethren.

The editors of Church papers, together with those of some of the synods that have not so closely cooperated in other movements, formed an editorial association, with the result that constructive work has been given more attention than the heated controversies that once absorbed a large part of their energy. Social unions composed of members of the different Bodies cultivated mutual acquaintance in such centers as New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and Pittsburgh. Intersynodical pastoral conferences contributed much towards a mutual understanding. Theological Faculties began to be edified by similar meetings. Meanwhile the Luther League

and, of late, the Lutheran Brotherhood made their influence felt.

As the time for the celebration of the Quadricentennial of the Reformation approached, the three Bodies appointed a Joint Committee, which early in 1916 opened an office in Philadelphia, and made extensive preparations for the event. A very general desire was entertained especially by prominent laymen, that the celebration should have as its permanent memorial the union of the various Lutheran Bodies into one organization — a project which none of those most conversant with the history of the General Bodies or best acquainted with their constituency, could have believed attainable within even a few years.

Such was the situation, when, on April 18th, 1917, the committee came together for what was thought to be its final session. At this meeting it was reported that a conference of influential laymen, mostly members of the committee on Finance urgently recommended that steps be taken immediately towards effecting, before the close of the year, the union of at least the General Synod, General Council and United Synod of the South. It was a startling announcement. For it was conceded that, in appointing the Quadricentennial committee, the three Bodies had authorized no such movement. This belonged properly to the sphere of another standing committee. If, however, it were, in transcendence of authority, to venture upon any extraordinary procedure, it seemed that it would be sufficient to ask the Bodies themselves to determine the details. But so deep was the sympathy of all present with the end proposed, and, so great was the apprehension of the danger of delay that the committee without a dissenting voice requested the Presidents of the three General Bodies, all of whom were present, to associate with themselves representatives from their Bodies, and to prepare a Constitution of a new organization for recommendation to these Bodies.

In the discussion, the fundamental position which guides the Lutheran Church in regard to all questions of Church Union, was not overlooked, viz. that unity in faith and doctrine must precede external union. The proposal, it was explained, had its strength in the fact that an inner unity already existed, that this inner unity had been the root of the various cooperative efforts that, for the last thirty years, had been in progress and had been crowned with so many evidences of the divine blessing, and that this unity, never so strong as to-day, must constrain those who thus know themselves to be inwardly united to manifest it in a common organization. The Confessional bases of the several Bodies, it was farther shown, are essentially the same, and could readily be coordinated.

When the commission appointed by the three Presidents, according to this action, met at Harrisburg, May 30th, conferences had already been held between the Boards of Foreign Missions, Home Missions, Church Extension and Publication of the three Bodies, and in each case with a favorable result. All currents bore in the same direction. In no case had there been any difficulty about maturing plans for their coalescence. During two days' sessions at Harrisburg, a tentative Constitution was prepared, which, at a later meeting on June 5th, was finally adopted for recommendation to the General Bodies represented. When with absolute unanimity the committee had decided upon the formula for the Confessional subscription, and there were no differences manifest with regard to the principles of Church organization, it was recognized that details of administration could readily adjust themselves.

There was some diversity as to the name to be given the new Body. Some objected to the title "The United Lutheran Church" as one which would not accurately describe it until it would actually include all Lutheran Synods in the country. But the sentiment predominated

that the name should express not simply what would be immediately attained, but rather the ideal which the new organization is to have in view. This ideal is not that this organization is to be an exclusive Body, confined to the three organizations that are now uniting, but that it invites, and until this purpose be attained continues to invite into union with it all other Bodies that are one with it in faith, and ready to accept its Constitution. It, therefore, passes no judgment and makes no reflection upon other Lutheran Bodies that prefer to be in isolation. While inviting them to participate, whenever they be ready, the advocates of this movement have felt the danger of the delay in case there be postponement until a larger number could be included. A beginning is, therefore, immediately attempted, with a strong nucleus comprising the oldest portion of the Church, around which, it is hoped, the rest may gather. The all-important question is that of agreement as to the confessional basis. With the basis proposed, the new Body will be in harmony with hundreds of thousands not as yet gathered within it, whether, by future action they unite, or prefer to remain independent. This confessional basis is as follows:

"The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule and standard according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

"The United Lutheran Church in America accepts the three ecumenical Creeds, namely the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian, as important testimonies drawn from the Holy Scriptures, and rejects all errors which they condemn.

"The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of the Evangelical

Lutheran Church, founded upon the Word of God; and acknowledges all churches that sincerely believe and faithfully confess the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession to be entitled to the name of Evangelical Lutheran.

"The United Lutheran Church in America recognizes the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalkald Articles, the Large and Small Catechism of Luther and the Formula of Concord, as in harmony of one and the same pure Scriptural faith."

The General Synod has been the first of the General Bodies to which this project has been submitted. In the presence of seven representatives from each of the other Bodies who assured it of the prevalent sentiment in favor of similar action among their constituency, the proposed Constitution was adopted. To be effective within the General Synod, it needs still the action of its twenty-four District Synods. Meanwhile it will be submitted to the General Council at its convention in Philadelphia at the close of October, and to the Southern Synod early in November at its meeting in Salisbury, N. C., in which Bodies the same reference to the District Synods will be necessary. Every indication, however, points to its acceptance. That it will have its critics among those outside the synods immediately concerned, is confidently expected. But it is hoped that by its devotion to the cause which it promises to serve it may put to silence all adversaries, and enlist them as allies in bringing into it, in due time, the rest of the numerous family of Lutherans in America.

Parallel and almost contemporaneous with the undertaking of which we have given some account, is that among the Norwegian Lutheran Synods, which culminated at St. Paul, Minn., on June 9th, when the three principal Norwegian Lutheran Bodies in this country united, in the presence of an audience of 10,000 people,

into "The Norwegian Church of America", a Body which numbers over 1200 ministers and 300,000 communicants. The two movements are not antagonistic to one another, but may ultimately merge in a still wider union. The statement of the Governor of South Dakota in the Norwegian Convention is certainly one which will have a general response: "The Union pleases all laymen. We could never understand why we were separate when we were confessing the same faith."

The Historical Approach to the Problem of Church Unity.

By Raymond Calkins, D.D.

My topic is the historical approach to the problem of Church unity. This historical method in our day is somewhat different from what it used to be. We have come to see that we can draw few reliable conclusions from a certain kind of historical research into the subject of Church origins and of Church authenticity. The effort, namely, to discover what was the habit and practice of the early and Apostolic Church as the basis for the reunion of Christendom has proved to be more or less futile. In the first place, that effort is sure to be inconclusive in its results. That is not to impugn the value of historical study, or to say that history is not a science; but as Canon Rawlinson has remarked, "Inasmuch as 'history never repeats itself,' historical conclusions, unlike those of the physical sciences, are unverifiable. They can never be subjected to the test of experiment, and consequently they can never be 'proved.'"[1] And since the evidence in the case is at its best "fragmentary and disputable," there will always be a "margin of ambiguity;" the facts in the case are "compatible" with the view of those who assert the theory of an original apostolic succession, but they do not "necessitate" it (p. 383), and the effort to lay the foundation of any theory of the Church on historical facts, and on these alone, is sure to be inconclusive and to lead nowhere. Moreover, even if it could be "proved", as we say, that this or that theory of the Church or practice of Church government did obtain

[1] *The Principle of Authority:* in the volume of *Foundations* p. 384.

in the Church of post-Apostolic times, it would not therefore follow that it is to be absolutely repeated in the belief and practice of to-day. The Church treasures many truths and follows many practices which admittedly are not to be found in the earliest history of the Church. The idea that the norm of the Church was determined in the first hundred years of its life would seem to limit the operation of the Holy Ghost.

But now there are two directions in which the historical method may well be applied—indeed must be, if we are to make any advance in our approach to the problem of Church unity. The first of these is a careful review of certain episodes in Church history, where the diverging currents of Church life may be said to have their origin. And the second of these is an historical explanation of the origin of those religious ideas which have become incorporated in the different communions of the Catholic Church and must be reunited in the One, Holy, Catholic Church, the object of our hopes and prayers. It is of these two uses of the historical method that I wish briefly to speak.

One of those crucial epochs in the history of the Church, in which divergent currents of Church life had their origin, is surely that of the Reformation. And, to illustrate partially our subject, let us look closely at one phase of the Reformation period, namely the development of Church life in England. We find ample materials here for a thoughtful and promising application of the use of a true historical inquiry. A careful review of this whole period in the light of modern Church thought and feeling, in the expectation that after that long and tragic story is reviewed some basis will be discovered on which reunion may be achieved, must have fruitful and permanent results. Was there ever a day when such a task could be entered upon so hopefully as at present?

No one, I think, can read even casually the story of the Puritan Secession, without being convinced of two things.

First, that the matters upon which men were divided were more fundamental than the matter of vestments, the sign of the Cross, the liberty to prophesy, the attitude at the Communion, the ring at the marriage service, the wording of the baptismal office. Had all these been conceded to the Puritan conscience, the division would not have ended. Doubtless Elizabeth and her advisers were right, when with keen eye they saw that the rift ran deeper; that it involved the more fundamental questions of faith and order. In theology, the difference was between the Arminian and the Calvinist; in form of worship, between the liturgist and the non-liturgist; in polity, between Episcopacy and either Presbyterianism or Independency. But now, serious as the differences doubtless were, another fact is equally clear. And it is this: that the failure to compose these differences was caused, not by their undoubted seriousness, not because these ideas were fundamentally incompatible and irreconcilable, but because of the temper of the time, the temper of the men who engaged in these high disputes, and because of the underlying assumptions which conditioned and controlled them. Looking back over these controversies with an impartial eye, one can see opportunity after opportunity thrown away, when, without detriment either to faith or order, principles which seemed to be opposed might have been comprehended in a higher unity, had there been that irenic and catholic mind and temper in the Church, which could have grasped both sides in this great issue and have understood them to be but parts of a greater whole. Had the Puritans but been less headstrong and radical in their demands, and had the Churchmen but been broader and more fraternal in their sympathies: had the Puritans been less insistent on breaking with the historic past of the Church, and had the Churchmen been more in touch with the age they had helped to produce, there had never been the great and lamentable failure to understand each other, and to compose the great ideas for which they stood.

But it was an age of division. It was a time of no-quarter in the intellectual and spiritual world. Great ideas were contending for the mastery. Religious feeling ran high. The political life of a whole nation was bound up in the religious struggle as had not been the case since the days of the Holy Roman Empire. What one party denied or resented in another, it claimed and defended for itself. The whole temper of the time made for division and not for unity.

Again: nothing is clearer than that the very idea of comprehension, which is essential to unity with liberty, was foreign to the mind of the age in which the great Separation took place. It was not an age of comprehension—it was an age of uniformity. The word comprehension was indeed on men's lips; but the only comprehension that men really comprehended was that which involved the unconditional surrender of their opponents. The idea of unity in diversity was both intellectually and spiritually unintelligible to an age which produced characters of the type of Elizabeth and of Laud, of Lord Clarendon and Richard Baxter. These people were not what in the language of the day could be called good "mixers;" and ideas for which they stood did not easily coalesce. Let one look beneath the surface of any of the three great historic and futile attempts which were made to hold together the Church, and one finds the underlying assumption of a uniformity of either one kind or another, the fatal rock on which they all split.

When King James at Hampton Court declared "that a presbytery agreeth as well with monarchy as God with the Devil," he put the case about as all men felt it. There were arguments in plenty to prove that the Church of England was divine in its origin and structure, and that the Puritan Church was the same. But one reads the whole bitter story without coming across a single argument to prove that both were taught of the same Spirit and were therefore compatible the one with the other.

The whole intellectual premise upon which these debates proceeded was that the one must supplant the other: in vain does one look for the accepted and controlling idea that the one might supplement the other. The materials for unity were at hand. They are to be found in the irenic declaration of Charles II when he called the Savoy Conference, of which a conformist writer said: "If ever a divine sentence was in the mouth of any king and his mouth erred not in judgment, I verily believe it was thus with our present majesty when he composed that admirable declaration, which next to Holy Scripture I adore and think that the united judgment of the whole nation cannot frame a better or more unexceptional expedient for a firm and lasting concord of these distracted Churches;"—they are to be found in the equally broad-minded address of William of Orange in his opening address to the House of Commons when he said: "I hope you will leave room for the admission of all Protestants that are willing and able to serve. Their conjunction in my service will tend to the better uniting you among yourselves and the strengthening you against your common enemies;" and even more explicitly they are to be found in the proposals of Dr. Tillotson, afterward archbishop, to the convocation ordered by William, which called for a review of the Liturgy; a leaving indifferent of certain ceremonies enjoined in the Liturgy or Canons; a recognition of the validity of the ordination of the ministers of foreign reformed Churches; and an agreement that those who have been ordained only by presbyters shall not be compelled to renounce their former ordinations.

The *materials* are not wanting: the history of the period abounds in propositions within which the unity of the Church might have been preserved. But no sooner do we enter the Savoy Conference, or open the doors of the Convocation of 1689, than we find the possibility of peace and unity outlawed at once, not for

the want of materials, but for want of the right temper, and the necessary underlying intellectual and spiritual assumptions which alone could use and shape those materials to the desired end.

To those who regard the visible unity of Christendom as the greatest need of our common Christianity, it must be a cause of ever-recurring regret that the efforts made to preserve that unity in the English-speaking Church came to nothing. But a review of that great historic failure has in it this great element of hope, that it reveals the undoubted fact that the reason for that failure lay not in the utter incompatibility of the ideas for which the great contending parties stood—but solely in the temper of the time and in the character of its ruling ideas. Once let that fact be gripped, and the future glows with promise. The temper of that age is not the temper of ours. The ruling ideas of that time are not the governing ideas of our own. What was wanting then is present now. The clash of contending principles, the strife of opposing ideas, has given way to broader ideas of peace and toleration. The fixed notion of uniformity has yielded to the more catholic idea of comprehension. In a word, the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere in which a Church unity that does not at the same time deny liberty can be understood and realized is as present in our day as it was absent in the day of the great separation. Imagine a Savoy Conference in the year of grace 1917. In imagination picture a second William of Orange appointing a Commission having for its deep spiritual purpose the prayerful consideration of those questions which still divide the children of a common spiritual ancestry. Such a Commission would meet not in an age of division, but of unity. The temper, the motion of mind and heart which tended then to keep men apart, to-day would draw them together. The conditions which operated to produce failure two centuries ago would conspire to success now.

Is it then too much to hope for that with the materials still in our hands, and with still greater spiritual possessions of the temper and ideas necessary for such a task—that we may resume in our day what was given up now over two centuries ago? What was a fruitless task then, may well be a fruitful one now; that which terminated then in a great division, may well terminate now in a new and glorious union. He would need to be entrenched within his own prejudices, blind to some of the most glowing pages of history, who should close his eyes to such a hope, and rule it out of the bounds of possibility. But he who says, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church," must believe that by the operation of the same Spirit we shall grow together into one household of God, being "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit."

The second application of the historical method in the approach to the problem of Church unity lies in the tracing to their psychological origins those religious ideas which have become incorporated in the life of different branches of the Catholic Church. It consists in an effort to appreciate what we may call the religious values of those forms of Church faith and practice which have survived nearly two thousand years of Christian life and worship, and to study how these may be united in a larger conception of the Church than any one of them separately represents. The presupposition is that the Holy Ghost has not ceased to operate in the heart of the Christian body. If therefore there is any solid consensus of opinion and practice which a considerable number of Christians cherish, which has been incorporated by them in institutional form and perpetuated by settled principle,

then that opinion, that practice has been authenticated, as it were, by the Holy Ghost. The problem is to have that opinion and practice recognized and its authentication admitted by the whole body of Christ's people. And when that is done, the true dimensions of the Catholic Church and its true inclusiveness will begin to appear, and its unity will rise of itself out of a broadened Christian consciousness. In a word, the one, true, Catholic and Apostolic Church already exists, the Body and the Bride of Christ. But it is not yet perceived, and it is not yet realized on earth. Each one of the separate communions on earth enshrines some portion of its total truth, and embodies some fragments of its total worth. But until each one perceives that it is not in itself that total truth and has not in itself that total worth, until each one comes to recognize the religious value of the truth embodied in other communions and thus for the first time perceives the Higher Truth of which they are all a part—Church unity lies in the realm of religious prophecy but not in the way of immediate fulfillment.

At the present time, therefore, the real labor of all who yearn for the unity of Christ's Church lies there. It lies in showing the entire compatibility of those seemingly opposite ideas of the Church for which the separate communions stand and to which they witness. It lies in showing that men are in the main right when they assert, and wrong when they deny. It lies in showing that neither are all right nor all wrong, but that the truth lies in a synthesis of those religious values for which each stands. Those who have insisted on the value of liturgical worship are right. History proves it. So are those who have insisted on the value of unpremeditated, open, congregational prayer. History proves that too. "Those who have insisted on a ministry of order are right; so are those who have insisted that the spirit of prophecy may light on any man." The theory of the Sacraments which insists that

the grace that is in them depends on the way in which that grace is mediated, is right; and so is the theory which declares that the grace depends on the faith of those who receive them. Under all of these conceptions there is a common truth which unites all Christians. If Christians can affirm the truth in which they do believe while the reality of that truth in which others believe is not presumed to be questioned or to be denied, an approach to unity is suggested which, if it be humbly followed, must, in the end, lead us to the Higher Truth which is the unity for which we all pray and to which we all aspire. That rediscovery is not best made by hasty attempts at external union. A common communion before we have acquired the spirit of union or the spiritual perception of the total truth which makes us one, can hardly hasten, but may seriously retard, our progress. But Christians of all communions need a spiritual education in those religious values which they do not hold, or which are not embodied in their own Church forms and practices. Here is a promising and needed effort in the field of Church union in the day in which we live.

Take, for example, the matter of Church worship. Christians are more divided at this point than most people like to believe. It is to be lamented that this is so, but there can be no doubt of it. I have heard Episcopalians who seldom attend any Church but their own, and who have certain qualms of conscience if they do, assert after leaving an orderly, dignified and reverent service of worship in a non-Episcopal Church, that it did not even seem to them that they had been to church at all. And non-Episcopalians untrained in the Prayer Book and its forms of worship frequently come away with anything but a restful and grateful sense of having been in the House of the Lord. Each has been so strictly trained in his own form and method of worship, that the other seems strange, unfamiliar, and often even forbidding. Yet underlying both there is the common faith that

where two or three are gathered together in His Name, there is He in the midst of them; that supernatural grace, of which the world knows nothing, awaits the souls that meet before the invisible throne of grace; that prayer can bring down unearthly blessings; that divine pardon can wash a guilty soul; that a lame man can be made to walk, and a heart dumb with its grief can be made to sing—that, in a word, spiritual miracles can be wrought akin to those that were wrought in ancient Galilee. But this faith in the efficacy of prayer and worship is expressed in different ways. Two different, and both true and efficient, theories of worship underlie the services of the Church. According to the one, the spirit of devotion is best expressed, the faith of the believer is best aroused, his heart touched and quickened, by the use of common and familiar forms of prayer, which gain in sweetness and in efficacy because they have been sanctified by age-long use and fall like the dew from Heaven upon the ear and heart of the believer. The service of worship is preserved in orderliness and assured in oneness to all believers, by the common use of its great manual and treasury of devotion, the Book of Common Prayer. On the other hand, there is the theory of worship which insists on the idea of spontaneity, which believes in giving the Spirit free rein and utterance, which feels itself limited and cramped by the necessity of reading the same lessons, repeating the same prayers, following the same forms week after week and year after year. A book of devotion has its place, according to this theory of worship, but not in prescribing the words or forms in which the quickened heart shall utter itself. And any theory of worship which does prescribe those forms, seems to it to put a limit on the liberty of prayer and prophecy which is a detriment to the pure and unrestrained worship and prayer of God's people.

And there you are. These two theories of worship, each sound in itself, exist side by side, and there is

precious little overlapping; there is precious little sign that after two or three centuries of co-existence each so much as recognizes the validity or the religious value of the other. It is rare enough, for example, that one hears free prayer in any Episcopal church. On the other hand, how rare it is in a non-Episcopal church ever to hear anything *but* free prayer. If the laymen in many of the non-liturgical Churches at the time of devotion hear coming what promises to be a collect, prejudice is likely to drive all thought of prayer from their minds. A minister using the Book of Common Pray is sure to be asked why he uses a book that belongs to another Church. When the matter of worship is discussed, that discussion usually consists in the defence of one or the other of these forms of prayer. Thus, Dr. Rainsford has said: "I do not believe that to the educated spiritual consciousness there is any special appeal in variety of extemporaneous prayer." And *per contra* old Cotton Mather has said that to use other than free and unstinted prayers is a virtual denial of the Holy Ghost. Those who believe in set prayer speak of the infelicities of extemporaneous prayer, and those who believe in free prayer speak of the formality and unhelpfulness of read prayers; and nowhere is there any perceptible approach to a general spiritual comprehension of the religious value of each. The fact is that the Anglican Church was the only Reformed Church which did not admit free prayer in its service; and the Puritan Church was the only Reformed Church which did not use set prayer. Every other Church recognizes the place of each in its liturgy. And not until the non-liturgical Churches recognize the value and the need of Common Prayer which touches that which is most catholic in us, "which strongly links us to our kind," and not until the Anglican Church restores to her liturgy the free and unrestrained language of aspiration and devotion, not until each of these two ideas of worship is reinforced by the other, shall we approximate

that spirit of unity which alone can lead to a reunited Church. A recent writer, Canon Rawlinson, in his article on the Church in the collection of essays called *Foundations*, an article from which I shall quote abundantly, has remarked that real Church unity, so far as Church worship is concerned, cannot take place until the Pope of Rome appreciates and values the Methodist prayer-meeting, or until the Puritan learns to worship with insight and devout intelligence at Mass in St. Peters.[2] That is expressing the thing of course in its ultimate terms. But some such synthesis in spiritual perception, and appreciation of religious values, is an absolute prerequisite to what we call Church unity. And how much of an education is needed a simple survey of the existing Church order is sufficient to demonstrate to any man's satisfaction.

Or here is the theory of the Church itself. Again, at least *au fond*, all Christians are at one. No one who bears the name and shares the faith of Christ would put the Church beside any other human organization, no matter what it is. A thirty-third degree Mason harboring a feeling for his order which is wholly beyond my ability to understand, and at the same time a member of I care not what Church, draws a line between the two which may be as thin as a hair, but at the same time as fine and hard as a diamond. Every Christian in his soul, be he rationalist or sacramentarian, evangelical or sacerdotalist, Protestant or Catholic, cherishes a supernatural idea of the Church, looks upon it as the Bride of Christ, the supreme object of His love, the Body of Christ, the very incorporation of His Spirit, the Heavenly City, the New Jerusalem, the Communion of Saints.

But now, starting with this community of idea, that idea proceeds to work itself out in two sharply contrasting theories of the Church. According to the one, the continuity of the Church life is to be found in the continuity of its

[2] *Foundation*, p. 403.

institutions, sacraments, ministry; according to the other, in the continuity of faith, of evangelic experience in the heart of the believer; according to the one, the Church is a kingdom whose power and authority is vested in its rulers and delegated to those below; according to the other, it is a democracy in which the power and authority is vested in the people and delegated to those who are above. According to the one, the Church is above all an outward and visible entity, authenticated in history by its apostolic priesthood, an organic body apart from which no Churches, but only other Christian bodies or communions, exist. According to the other, the Church is above all an invisible and spiritual order, authenticated in history by the perpetuation of faith in the hearts of Christ's people, so that wherever faith is, there is the Church, and wherever faith is not, there, no matter what external proprieties may exist, there is no Church. According to the one, the outstanding Church figure is the priest; according to the other, the prophet.

In a word, the one is the Catholic, the other the Protestant idea of the Church. The one lays stress on the institutional, the other on the non-institutional and purely evangelical idea, of which the one tends to regard the ministry as primarily sacerdotal, the other as primarily prophetic. Of course this antithesis is never quite absolute; the priest is expected to give some spiritual evidence of vocation, and the prophet is expected to have some form of ordination. Nevertheless it is from a divergence of respective emphasis upon the priestly and prophetic ideas of the ministry that whatever is distinctive in the two great historic Christian positions proceeds. Upon the one hand "we have the ministry of the Sacraments given the primary place; stress laid upon institutions as the media of the Spirit's operation; the conception of ordination, not as the recognition, but as the bestowal of an office, and therewith of the 'charisma' or gift of grace needed to sustain it; and the strict requirement that men shall

not take upon themselves the discharge of functions in the Church to which they have not been formally commissioned."[3] But upon the other hand, the supreme and determining principle is simply the *Gospel*; it is by the heart of faith that the Spirit is received; not the Sacrament but Christians are the true "extension of the Incarnation;" and the Christian community is to be sought primarily not in any outward and visible network of ecclesiastical organization, but in the purely spiritual entity begotten and constituted by the Gospel.

Now these two ideas also have been incorporated in two co-existent, parallel organizations which cannot come into union, much less intercommunion, because there is no underlying spiritual apprehension of the religious value, importance and indispensability of the truth to which the other bears witness and of which it is a visible embodiment. But there is no likelihood that either will disappear. The Catholic idea is certainly here to stay. But so is the Protestant. And the ministries of various Protestant denominations may quite legitimately point to the witness of the souls they shepherd and may exclaim with St. Paul, "the seal of our apostleship are ye in the Lord." Regenerate souls, to their thinking, constitute a validity of the Spirit which far transcends the validity of outward continuity or of visible ordination. If each of these is here to stay, the hope and the only hope of Reunion lies in a spiritual apprehension by the proponents and believers of each in the truth for which the other stands.

Yet such an appreciation by the Protestant of the Catholic Idea of the Church, and conversely by the Catholic of the Protestant Idea, is just what is most noticeably absent at the present time. The average Protestant, though he be educated in Church history and even trained in the development of Church theory for the past two thousand years, looks upon the Catholic Idea of

[3] *Foundations*, p. 382.

the Church as an un-Scriptural, an unspiritual and an unwarranted crystallization in external and material forms, of the 'pure Gospel.' To him it is an obstruction in the path of Christianity, which must be swept away by the rising tides of Spirituality before the Church can hope to win the assent and loyalty of intelligent and enlightened men. The Catholic Idea of the Church is to him a survival of Mediævalism in our modern world. It is an anachronism which cannot continue much longer. I have talked with many eminent Protestant preachers and teachers, and it is the rare exception to discover one who has any patience with or any sympathetic or spiritual conception of the Catholic Idea of the Church.

Per contra, it is difficult to find a Catholic who sees an historic or spiritual basis for the Church in the Protestant position. He finds there much that is 'true' in individual Christian experience. He discovers all the marks of a genuine Christian piety, an undoubted Christian faith, an admirable ardour for the propagation of the Gospel. But there is nothing in this of an ecclesia, a divinely instituted and authenticated entity which is the very Body of Christ and Organ of His Spirit.

And there you are again. And again a fundamental education in religious values alone can cause these two Ideas to coalesce and point the way to their final union in the truly Catholic Church. The Protestant must come to apprehend the indispensability of the Catholic position; and the Catholic must learn to recognize the validity of the Protestant witness; and together they must mount to the higher Truth which includes them both.

"Each of the two great Christian types has need to be at once the scholar and teacher of the other. The final unity (which must assuredly be outwrought in God's good time) will come not by way of compromise, but by way of comprehension. Truth is a synthesis, not an elimination, of differences, and the claims of conflicting 'authorities' must be harmonized by being included

and justified, not negated, in the ultimate whole."[4] So-called Catholic religion must include, if it would be perfect, the so-called Protestant idea. At its best this stands for personal religion, for the spiritual freedom of the individual, and for his answerableness in the last resort to his Maker alone; for the prophetic word as the dynamic which alone can vitalize the ritual of the priest; for the truth of evangelism and the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. "The Catholicism of the future certainly cannot afford to disregard the truths of the Protestant witness, and must to a certain extent reinterpret and revalue (without abandoning) its institutionalism in the light of them."[5] It will recognize the right of all Christian communities animated by the Spirit of Christ to be included in that one Communion of Saints which is the blessed Body of Christ's faithful people; it will recognize the spiritual validity of any Protestant pastor as a true and godly minister of the Lord, although it might be difficult or impossible to recognize him apart from episcopal ordination as in the catholic sense and for Catholics a qualified minister of the Sacraments; it will stress the faith of the believer *as well as* the regular responsibility of the ministrant as giving grace to the Sacraments; and it will view the Sacraments themselves as one of the means of grace rather than as the sole method of the impartation of the full sacramental grace of Christ.

On the other hand, Protestantism with its emphasis upon personal faith, personal authority, personal responsibility, personal religion, will grow, must grow into an appreciation of the importance, indispensability of the Catholic point of view. It must grasp the necessity of institutionalism, "of rites and sacraments, as being neither dead forms, nor illogical excrescences upon a religion otherwise wholly spiritual, but as being themselves

[4] *Foundations*, p. 405.
[5] *Foundations*, p. 405.

spirit and life the natural and normal media of the operation of the Word-made-Flesh. So, again, Catholicism witnesses to the glory of Churchmanship, the sense of spiritual kinship and unity, not with a section of Christendom, but with the whole; to the idea of worship, as prior in religion to that of edification; to the communion of quick and dead in Christ's mystical Body" all of which "represent elements of historic religion which neither Protestantism nor the universal Church of the future can afford to lose."[6] It is here that Protestantism is weak to-day. Its sense of Churchmanship and solidarity, of universality, of compactness, of institutionalism—is all weak where it needs to be strong.

What we need to pray for, then, is not that this or that experiment of reunion shall succeed, not that this or that plan of an interlocking Church relationship shall work out, but that these two great contrasting Church positions and ideas, each with a noble history, each with spiritual first-fruits to justify its truth, each firmly embedded in the religious consciousness of our time and of all time, shall come to understand each other; more than this, shall come to understand that each has that to give the other without which it cannot fully realize its own true, best life. What we need to hope and pray for is, that out of a reunited consciousness, out of a Church consciousness in which these two great historic, but by no means exclusive, Ideas shall have met and fused,—that Church, one in faith, hope, doctrine, one in spirit, love and truth, may rise on earth in which all the children and families of our Lord shall meet, and there shall be one fold, one Shepherd, and one Bishop of our souls.

[6] *Foundations*, p. 404.

Origin of the Misunderstanding Between the Roman Church and the East

By Louis Bréhier,
Professor in the University of Clermont-Ferrand.

In a former study we tried to show that up to the ninth century the normal condition of relations between the Western Church and the East had been troubled at times by passing, but never irremediable schisms.[1] The attacks of Photius against the Roman primacy had a graver character and put in question the very foundations of the Church. And yet a new *modus vivendi* got established and lasted more than half a century, from 896 to 1054. The schism of Michael Caelularius was, on the other hand, a very sharp break which the double intransigence of the Byzantine patriarch and of Pope Leo IX. made irrevocable. The religious question then became complicated with political and territorial interests, for the undertakings of Leo IX. in southern Italy were a menace to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. Presently all the churches under the influence of Constantinople, the patriarchates of the East, the Russian and Bulgarian churches, and so on, broke at the same time with Rome. The alliance of the papacy with the Normans of Italy, concluded a little later by the advice of Hildebrand and destined to safeguard the Roman Church against the plans of the Germanic emperors, bore

[1] See The Constructive Quarterly, December, 1916. L. Bréhier, *Normal Relations between Rome and the Church of the East before the Schism of the Eleventh Century.*

also the character of an act of hostility against Constantinople and made the rupture yet more complete.

From that time Greeks and Latins mutually regarded one another as schismatics. To the régime of normal relations and of peace succeeded war. Now, at the moment when the last ties that bound the Greeks to the West were thus broken, the Byzantine Empire, attacked on every frontier, by the Petchenegs, by the Turks, by the Normans, seemed menaced with approaching destruction. In the West, on the contrary, at the end of the eleventh century feudal anarchy so long dominant was becoming organized. Military lordships were being founded, providing the framework for states just coming into being, and animated at first by an aggressive, conquering spirit. Such were the Norman states of Italy under the sons of Tancred of Hauteville; such the maritime powers, Venice, Genoa, Amalfi, whose fleets began to furrow the Mediterranean. But in the eyes of all these Occidentals, avid, eager to conquer territory or to grow rich by trade, the East, Byzantine or Mussulman, seemed like a wonderland where was amassed the whole wealth of the world. From the tenth century onward an unbroken tide of pilgrims and adventurers had ebbed and flowed between the West and the East. Some went to venerate the Holy Places, others to seek their fortune and to enlist in the army of the *basileus*,—the famous imperial guard of the Varanges was formed in that way of Anglo-Saxons,—while in the eleventh century certain captains of Norman mercenaries, a Roussel de Bailleul, for example, almost succeeded in carving out sovereignties for themselves in the land of the Mussulmans.

All these, merchants, pilgrims, adventurers, once they had returned to their own country, described the marvellous lands and populous cities through which they had passed. Constantinople especially seems to have exercised by its enchanting environment, by its wealth, the magnificence of its churches and the splendour of the

imperial ceremonial, an irresistible attraction on the imaginations of men. Of this we have unquestionable witness in that curious poem, The Pilgrimage of Charlemagne, which apparently antedates the First Crusade. Here we see the King of France and his twelve peers dazzled by the marvels of a legendary Byzantium, whose aged king turns his own furrow in his own field with a golden ploughshare and dwells in an enchanted palace. And when Charlemagne, after having successfully undergone the tests imposed on him, appears, his head girt with the golden diadem, in the midst of the imperial procession, the naïve minstrel cannot restrain an exultant cry:

"Charles wears the crown in Constantinople!"

That, it seems, is the supreme honour that can befall a mortal, and it is quite within probable bounds that recitals like this contributed not a little to sustain in the West the prestige of the imperial city and even to determine the calling of certain crusades. The great pilgrimages, as important as military expeditions, that of Richard, Abbot of St. Vanne in 1026 and, especially, that of Günther, Bishop of Bamberg in 1065, emphatically directed the attention of the Occidentals to the wealth of the East.

But it was at just this moment that the aggression of the Seljuk emirs in Asia Minor led the Byzantine emperors to solicit the aid of the West. In 1073 Emperor Michael VII, not content with drawing Western mercenaries into his army, addresses himself to Pope Gregory VII and promises him in exchange for his good offices the ending of the Greek schism. This action has thus a primary importance. From the outset the question of the defence of the Byzantine empire against the Turks is bound up with the question of religious union, and will continue to be so bound even to 1453, to the great detriment of Christianity. It is then the Byzantine emperors who

first did their part to draw Western soldiers on to Eastern roads. No doubt they thought only of enlisting auxiliaries and enrolling them in their army. The idea of a crusade is wholly foreign to them. But as a result of these calls for aid the idea was not slow in spreading through the West that a great expedition to the East was the only cure for the difficulties of that present moment. The West could thus, at one stroke, put an end to the schism of the Greeks, deliver the churches of Asia from Mussulman domination and drive the infidel from the Holy Places.

This very natural idea had its birth toward the end of the eleventh century. It was destined to dominate to the end of the Middle Ages the whole history of the relations between East and West and to culminate in the catastrophe of 1204. We are touching now the cause of the irremediable misunderstanding which, from this time, is going to separate the two Churches and to give a wrong twist in advance to all the efforts that they have since made to get together.

I.

It was Pope Gregory VII who first formulated the idea of solving the religious difficulties by means of an expedition to the East. Doubtless, there was no question as yet of a true crusade and no special indulgence was promised to those who should take arms. Yet the Pope in his letter to Henry IV, king of the Romans, in 1074, announces his purpose to put himself at the head of a great army to deliver the East from the infidels and to bring back the dissident churches into the unity of the faith. Thus he set forth the whole programme of the mediaeval popes: To reestablish Christian unity, so as to contend better against the infidels.

The attitude of Urban II toward the East was somewhat different It is on his own initiative and without any solicitation from Alexius Comnenius that in 1095 he

invites the faithful to take the Cross. In the appeal that he addresses to them there is no question of the reunion of the two Churches but only of the liberation of those Eastern Christians who have fallen under the yoke of the Turks, and of the conquest of the Holy Sepulchre. The crusade appeared, then, with an ideal and generous goal, to defend Christianity against Islam. It is the "holy war", organized by the Church and subjected by it to canonical legislation. At the outset no purpose of conquest is visible and there is no preconceived plan to be seen for the organization of future conquests. It seems as though the masses of men who rush through the valley of the Danube with Peter the Hermit for their guide have never troubled themselves, any more than the high barons who form the warrior bands, to determine in advance what shall become of the territories that they are going to conquer. Animated by a single faith they set before themselves for the war only two aims: to get remission of their sins and to deliver the Holy Sepulchre and Jerusalem from the Mussulman yoke.

But the ideal of the crusade could not long be maintained at such a height. Face to face with the simply religious spirits whom faith alone has impelled to abandon their native country appear those who are guided by the love of fair adventure and especially the politicians who wished to make this outburst of enthusiasm serve temporal and purely practical ends. Such was the emperor, Alexius Comnenus, such were the Norman princes of Italy, Bohemond and his nephew Tancred, such were the maritime powers, Venice and Genoa, whose aid was indispensable to the crusaders, but who had no intention of giving it except in return for positive advantages.

The emperor Alexius had not urged the launching of the crusade. What he urged on the Occidentals was simply to send auxiliary troops whom he could include in his army. Upset and frightened by this gigantic exodus which he had not foreseen he sought at first to

limit the damage that the transit of bands of fighting men and of the common people might bring to his subjects. Then, true to the traditional policies of the Byzantine empire, he tried to exploit the movement to better his own interests. His aim was to get from the barons, on their passage through Constantinople, feudal homage for the territories that had formerly been part of the empire and that they were proposing to conquer.

But this alliance between the crusaders and the emperor did not last long. On one side the emperor showed in the matter of the taking of Nicea a duplicity that made the crusaders indignant. On the other side his ambitions clashed with those of the high barons. It was the Norman princes, Bohemond and Tancred, who made the spirit of conquest dominant in the crusade. Even the Count of Toulouse, Raymond de St. Gilles, who at first had refused to pay homage to the emperor because he deemed it contrary to the aim of the crusade, contended fiercely with Bohemond over the possession of Antioch and allied himself against his rival with the same emperor. From that moment none of the barons had any other idea than to look out for himself. Baldwin of Lorraine becomes Lord of Edessa, Bohemond keeps Antioch, Raymond de St. Gilles establishes himself in Tripoli, Godfrey of Bouillon is chosen King of Jerusalem.

Thus the crusade ends in the establishment of Latin principalities in the East and for the papacy there is a veritable spiritual conquest corresponding to this temporal conquest. Two of the ancient patriarchates of the East, those of Antioch and Jerusalem, which Michael Caerularius had succeeded in carrying away into his schism, are from now on subordinated to the Holy See. A powerful Latin hierarchy is established in Syria. Bishops, monasteries, military orders are provided with rich donations and the clergy becomes the greatest holder of real estate in the kingdom. In fact, though, the native clergy was not disturbed and Greek bishops are found

serving a Latin archbishop as suffragans. More than this, the old sects, numerous in Syria, the Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, enjoyed the greatest tolerance. The dominant churchmen went so far as even to concede to each of them a distinct chapel at the Holy Sepulchre.

The Holy See had then in Syria a religious policy of conciliation, but it demanded that each of the sects should recognize its supremacy, at least in a formal way.

The spirit of conquest, born in the first crusade, developed in the course of the twelfth century. The Byzantine empire, revived by the Comneni, took the offensive against the Latin states. Johannes and Manual Comnenus succeeded in imposing a Greek patriarch on Antioch and almost realized the scheme of Alexius, which consisted in imposing imperial suzerainty on the Latin principalities. But this Byzantine policy of conquest clashed on one side with the economic interests of the Italian cities in the East and on the other side with the ambitions of the Normans of the Two Sicilies. Worse still for them, the idea began to be current in the West that this hostility of the Byzantine government was the principal obstacle to the success of the crusade.

The Norman princes of the Two Sicilies tried to exploit this feeling to their own profit and also contributed to spread it. Bohemond's attack on the empire in 1107 failed pitifully, but in 1147 Roger II was able to sieze possession of Corfu and to pillage Greece with impunity. When, at the call of St. Bernard, a new crusade is organized in 1149 Roger makes every effort to turn it aside on Constantinople. He tries to circumvent the king of France, among whose advisers men like Peter the Venerable, St. Bernard himself, Suger, Abbot of St. Denis, are favorable to these projects. The opposition of Pope Eugenius III, to whom Louis VII communicated them when he passed through Tivoli, made the plan fail, but the aversion of the Occidentals to the Greeks was such that at the very moment when Louis VII was the guest

of Manuel Comnenus at Constantinople the Bishop of Langres was still advising him to begin the crusade by seizing possession of the imperial city. Such a proposal could have no success with a king of France. But the idea of turning a crusade aside on Constantinople was none the less launched by the middle of the twelfth century. Fifty years later it was going to become a reality.

During that interval the relations between the Occidentals and Byzantium kept getting more bitter. In 1150 Suger is still thinking of forming alliances with these same Occidentals. But the favor that he shows them and the good understanding that he maintains with the popes excite the anger of the Greeks. His death in 1180 [2] is followed by a reaction against the Latins which the unscrupulous ambition of Andronicus Comnenus understood how to exploit without scruple. Himself a usurper of the throne, he consolidated his power by unchaining popular grudges against the Latin settlements at Constantinople. The massacre of the Occidentals in 1182 is the inexpiable deed that paved the way for the reprisals of 1204. From that moment the contest between the West and Byzantium is open and acts of hostility are constantly increasing. It appears now in the attack on the empire by William II of Sicily in 1185; now in the alliance of Isaac Angelus with Saladin in 1189; now in the hostility shown by him to Frederick Barbarossa in 1190, during his passing through the Balkan peninsula, now in the occupation of an imperial province, the island of Cyprus, by Richard Lion-heart in 1191. And above all it is shown in the preparations of the emperor Henry VI, heir of the Norman kings of the Two Sicilies, to come to a final accounting with the Byzantine empire. A fleet was already gathered at Messina and the emperor was about to embark for Constantinople when he died prematurely, September 28, 1198.

[2] The generally received date for the death of Abbot Suger is 1151 or 1152.—*The translator.*

At the end of the twelfth century the idea that prevails in the West is that the knotty point of the Eastern question is no longer in Palestine. According to some it is rather to be sought in Egypt, and this is the solution that seems preferable to the popes and their advisers. According to others, on the contrary, only the destruction of the Byzantine empire can assure the success of the crusade. The family of Hauhenstaufen especially represents this tendency. A Ghibeline crusade sets itself up in opposition to the Guelf.

Such are the direct antecedents of the event of 1204, which in reality is simply a carrying out of the Ghibeline plan. The numerous researches of the specialists into that event have established to a certainty that it took place against the will of the pope and that it is the result of an intrigue whose authors are Philip of Swabia, Venice and the high barons.

Without referring to these critical discussions let us try to follow the sequence of those events which are clearly established today.

Since his accession in January, 1198, Innocent III was busy in organizing the crusade. His correspondence with the Holy Land, the relations that he maintained even with the bishops and rulers of Armenia show the place that the restoration of the Christian East took in his plans. But to assure the success of the future expedition he undertook first to settle the question of religious union with Constantinople through personal negotiations with Alexius III. The pope and the Byzantine emperor had, as it happened, the same enemies. Isaac Angelus, who had been dethroned by Alexius III, was the father-in-law of Philip of Swabia, the brother of Henry VI and heir of his designs on Constantinople. They had therefore concurrent interests and the first approaches came from Alexius III. While carrying on negotiations with him the pope had the crusade preached and the movement, directed in France by Foulque de Neuilly reached

its climax at the famous tournament of Ecry-sur-Aisne on November 28, 1199, where a great number of the barons of Northern France took the cross. However, in spite of the urging of the pope the chief sovereigns of the West remained neutral or hostile.

Even the organization of the crusade was without the cooperation of Innocent III. The barons acted on their own initiative and thought it enough to ask the pope to ratify their resolutions. Villehardouin was sent to Venice where he signed, in March, 1201, a treaty with the republic for the transportation (*passage*) of the crusaders to the Holy Land. Even after the death of Thibaud de Champagne, May 6, 1201, the barons did not consult the pope when they elected Boniface of Montferrat leader of the crusade. It seems as though from that moment Innocent begins to show some apprehension about the outcome. On May 8, 1201, he ratifies the treaty for "passage" that had been made with Venice, but on condition that a papal legate should accompany the expedition and that no harm should be done to any Christian people whatever, unless the march of the crusaders should be malevolently hindered.

At this moment, however, occurred the dramatic incident that was to bring about the misdirection of the crusade. Alexius, son of Isaac Angelus, escaped from the palace where he had been detained with his father. He landed in Italy in the spring of 1201 and his first act was to go to the pope to solicit the restoration of his father, while promising Innocent religious union. Then Prince Alexius went to Germany to be with his brother-in-law Philip of Swabia and, by a strange coincidence, on December 25, 1201, Philip of Swabia had an interview at Hagenau with the leader himself of the crusade, Boniface of Montferrat. We cannot tell what they talked about but the sequence of events permits us to conjecture: They decided no doubt to make the crusade serve in the first instance for the restoration of Isaac Angelus.

In May, 1202, Boniface of Montferrat in fact betakes himself to Rome to propose openly to the pope this restoration. He stumbles on a refusal and, without insisting, is content to discuss with the pope the affairs of the crusade.

In June, 1202, the crusaders begin to gather at Venice. The prince Alexius has them canvassed in his behalf and this whole business is carried on secretly without the knowledge of the pope. It was then that in November the crusaders finding that they could not meet the engagements that they had made with the Venetians made a new treaty with them. In return for a remission of the payments still due they undertook to recapture the city of Zara which had revolted against the republic. The Venetians, Doge Andrew Dandelo at their head, took the cross.

We have proof today that this turning aside to Zara was thought of by the leaders of the crusade only as a device to gain time and to get the consent of the pope to the restoration of Isaac Angelus. This restoration had been already determined on. Indeed, immediately after the taking of Zara the crusaders sent to Rome the cardinal-legate Peter of Capua to ask the pope to approve their resolution. At the same moment ambassadors from Alexius III came to urge the pope in the contrary sense. Innocent III submitted the matter to his council and refused approbation to the crusaders. He remained to the end faithful to his alliance with Alexius III.

Then events hurried to a climax. The crusaders determined to take no notice of the pope's refusal and to confront him with an accomplished fact. In November, 1202 Innocent III in a spirit of conciliation consents to remove the excommunication which the crusaders have incurred in attacking Zara, a Christian territory. At the same time Boniface of Montferrat arrives at Zara to take command of the expedition. Then on January 1, 1203, comes an embassy from Philip of Swabia who openly

unmasks his schemes and proposes to the crusaders to undertake the restoration of Isaac Angelus. In the name of Prince Alexius he promises them that the Byzantine empire shall be placed again under the Roman obedience, that the restored emperor will pay them an indemnity of 200,000 silver marks, will share in the crusade and will maintain 500 knights in the Holy Land.

On April 7, 1203, the pretender himself appears in the camp before Zara and confirms these promises. The fleet weighs anchor immediately and steers for Corfu. After three weeks' stay and animated discussions the march on Constantinople was at last agreed upon and they set out on May 24, 1203. At the same time the pope sent a brief to the crusaders to charge them, with all formality, not to attack the Byzantine empire. It was already too late.

The sequence of events, therefore, admits no doubt as to the character of the intrigue that turned the crusade aside in spite of the will of the pope. That intrigue was at once Ghibeline and Venetian. Boniface of Montferrat, a cousin of Philip of Swabia, let himself be won over to Philip's plans. The Hauhenstaufen, the natural leader of the Ghibeline crusade, was himself detained in the West by his contest with the Guelfs. But we have proof that he himself directed the secret negotiations that were designed to thwart the action of the pope. It was he who brought the leaders of the crusade to the decision to undertake the restoration of Isaac Angelus and his son.

The action of Venice is harder to comprehend. It is none the less certain for all that, for without the consent of the Venetians no expedition against Constantinople would have been possible. It has been shown and is today an assured fact of history that the pretended secret treaties concluded by Venice with the Sultan of Egypt are apocryphal. Venice did not just simply betray Christianity as the chronicler Ernoul, a suspicious witness, accused her of doing. A treaty between Venice and

Egypt, which Karl Hopf dated arbitrarily in 1202, bears in fact no date at all and cannot well be earlier than 1208. But, to be sure, the Venetians had every reason to wish the overthrow of Alexius III whose power had been very unwelcome to them. The emperor had in fact since his accession never ceased his efforts to make a breach in the commercial supremacy of Venice in the East. To bring this about he favored, as far as he could, the rivals of Venice, the Pisans and the Genoese. Alexius III does not renew the treaty made between Venice and Isaac Angelus on its expiration in 1198. On the contrary in that same year he confirms the privileges of the Pisans and in 1201 he makes a treaty with Genoa, extending the boundaries of the Genoese quarter in Constantinople. In 1201 then the commercial situation of Venice in the Byzantine empire was gravely compromised and it is easy to see why Doge Henry Dandalo received the proposals of the pretender with such favour. For him it was a matter of using the crusade to reestablish the position of Venice in the East.[3]

The turning aside of the crusade, therefore, took place against the will of the pope, who, on the other hand, used every effort to keep the crusaders on the road to Egypt. Far from being a victory for the Roman Church the attack on Constantinople proclaims the bankruptcy of the crusading idea which has now been made to subserve temporal ends.

No doubt in the minds of most of the crusaders those ends were to be limited to the restoration of Isaac Angelus and of his son. When that was accomplished they would take up again the plan of an attack on Egypt. But the logic of facts proved stronger than their will. Replaced on the imperial throne Isaac Angelus and his son had not the power to keep the fair promises they had made. The alliance between them and the crusaders broke down

[3] The facts have been brought together by Fotheringham in *Marco Sanudo, Conqueror of the Archipelago.* Oxford, 1915, pp. 17–20.

and these latter had to besiege Constantinople once more. This time it was conquest, pure and simple. The Ghibelines with Boniface of Montferrat had managed the intrigue that had resulted in the restoration of the pretenders. The conquest of Constantinople, on the other hand, was the exclusive work of the Venetians who, in the treaty that they had made with the crusaders in March, 1204, had made a division in advance of the spoils of the empire and had reserved for themselves the lion's share. After the taking of Constantinople on April 12, 1204, it was the Venetians who hindered Boniface of Montferrat from assuming the imperial throne and secured the election of Baldwin, Count of Flanders.

So the Occidentals who had set out with the cross on their breasts to deliver the Holy Sepulchre appeared to the Greeks only in the light of greedy conquerors. While the high barons shared the empire among themselves the mere knights invaded the palaces and the monasteries and plundered their wealth. The clerics showed themselves strangely eager in despoiling the churches of their relics. There are still today many churches in the West which owe their most venerated relics to the sack of Constantinople, while at the very threshold of the basilica of San Marco the bronze horses of the Byzantine hippodrome still stand as a proud trophy of the victory of Venice. The taking of Constantinople was followed by an effort to subdue the whole empire. The small number of the crusaders, the formation of two centres of resistance, one in Epirus under the dynasty of the Angeli, the other at Nicea, with Theodore Lascaris as its head, joined to the attacks of the Bulgarians of Johannitsa, hindered the crusaders from the complete realization of their programme of conquest. And yet from 1205 onward the East was strewn with Latin foundations, many of which had been set up by mere barons; empire of Constantinople, kingdom of Thessalonica, duchy of Athens, principality of the Morea, Venetian possessions

in the Archipelago, in Crete, in the Ionian islands. At the same time the kingdom of Cyprus was just completing its organization under the dynasty of Lusignan. The conquerors might cherish the illusion that in disobeying the orders of the pope they had indeed put an end to the schism of the Greeks and assured for all time in the East the supremacy of Rome.

II.

What then were to be the relations in religion between the conquerors and the conquered? According to the very principles of canon law the temporal conquest of the East in no way involved as its consequence the absorption of the Greek Church by the Latin. The conquest could at the most give friendly countenance to a religious union that must be obtained from a formal adhesion of the Greek Church. That union once effected the Greek Church would return to its status before 1054; communion with Rome, autonomous institutions, native clergy, national rites.

But this solution, which would no doubt have been preferable, presupposed conditions that could not be realized. It would have called, in the first place, for a very improbable disinterestedness and abnegation on the part of the conquerors, as well clerical as lay. The lands and the revenues of the Greek Church were too tempting a prey for the necessitous clerics and knights as well as for the high barons.

And then these men of the thirteenth century would have needed to have a thorough acquaintance with religious history, such as they could not have. To have asked them to restore the ecclesiastical status before the schism would have been a chimerical venture. Between 1054 and 1204 the position of the papacy in public regard had been profoundly changed. The spiritual supremacy of the Holy See was now recognized by all; even its temporal supremacy had numerous defenders.

Since the schism of the Greeks the Roman Church, by itself alone, represented the universal catholic Church. What it exacted from other churches was no longer merely communion but submission in matters of dogma and of discipline. The Christian republic was tending to take on a monarchical form.

And lastly on the part of the Greeks a spirit of conciliation would have been called for which they were far from possessing. When they submitted it was by constraint and in their hearts they kept all their intransigence. The chronicle of Nicetas has left us an echo of the exasperation that the sack of Constantinople and the thefts of relics had evoked among them. A pamphlet of the time, emanating no doubt from the Greek clergy of Constantinople, entitled Our Grievances against the Latin Church, gives a long enumeration as silly as it is malevolent of the practices among the Latins to which the Greeks object. Beside serious divergences, as in regard to the marriage of priests, we find that Greeks cannot share communion with men who shave their beards, who eat fish in Lent, meat on Wednesdays, and the like.[4]

The more moderate among the Greek clergy in a very fine letter addressed to Innocent III about 1213 declared that they were quite willing to make an attempt at conciliation, but only on condition that the difficulties should be settled by an ecumenical council and that no force should be employed to obtain their adhesion.[5]

The question seemed thus insoluble. So force triumphed. Temporal conquest had as its results spiritual conquest and constraint. And so it came about that the cleft between the two Churches grew wider. This will become evident when we come to examine the religious relations that were established between the conquerors

[4] See Luchaire, *Innocent III. La Question d'Orient.* Paris, 1907, pp. 238–243.

[5] Luchaire, *loc. cit.*, pp. 251–257.

and the conquered. We shall study in turn the action of the pope, the Latin occupation in the ecclesiastical sphere and the measures designed to effect union.

The taking and the sack of Constantinople by the army of the crusade was a real check for Innocent III. The crusaders had disobeyed his formal orders in attacking a Christian people and in abandoning the route to the Holy Land. The efforts that he had been making for many years to secure the adhesion of the Greek Church to some settlement of the questions under discussion were made futile at a blow. But a politician like Innocent III cannot stay long out of action. As soon as the first moment of stupefaction had passed he viewed the taking of Constantinople as a providential event. The crusaders had been only the instruments of the divine vengeance upon the errors of the Greeks and the obstacles that they had opposed to the crusade. Such are the ideas developed by him both in his correspondence with the emperor Baldwin and in his letter "to the clergy and to all the people of the Christian army of Constantinople".

Nothing else is left then for the pope except to get for the good of Christianity the greatest possible profit from events that have been brought about without his participation. Since Romania has fallen into the power of the Occidentals it is to become for them as it were a fortress, an impregnable point of support that shall assure the success of future crusades. So the pope enjoins the crusaders to remain another year in Romania that they may help the emperor Baldwin to complete his conquest. Already in the autumn of 1204 his legates, Peter of Capua and Soffrid Cajetani, set out for Constantinople with a hundred knights, and other reenforcements are solicited throughout the West. Romania was, then, to become, in even larger measure than the pope had hoped, the principal auxiliary of the crusade.

But that such a result should be possible it was necessary to make a clean-cut settlement of all the religious

difficulties that had been obstacles to pacification. Now, just as the pope could not prevent the taking of Constantinople, he had not power, either, to organize the church of Romania and to effect a religious union at his pleasure. Here too the crusaders put him face to face with an accomplished fact.

From the very first days of the conquest the crusaders, on their own initiative, had taken two series of measures of an irreparable character. In the first place they put, on their own sole authority, Latin clerics at the head of the churches and monasteries. The task was facilitated for them by the Greek higher clergy itself, whose members had abandoned their posts and taken refuge at Nicea or in Epirus. In the second place they undertook to secularize the larger part of the property of the Greek church. In the treaty concluded with Venice in March, 1204, it had been decided that they should leave to the Church only the properties necessary for its subsistence and in all the occupied territories this decision was rigorously carried out. The pope exerted himself in every way to maintain discipline among these clerks greedy at the quarry and to safeguard in some degree the interests of the Greek Church.

At Constantinople Venice laid claim to the finest monasteries, Pantepopte, Pantocrator, Peribleptos. In addition, according to the March treaty the church of Saint Sophia and the patriarchate had been set aside for her. The Greek patriarch Johannes Kamateros was declared deposed. Thirteen canons, all Venetians, installed themselves at Saint Sophia and elected as patriarch a young Venetian noble, Thomas Morosini, who up to that time had reached only the subdiaconate. Innocent III annulled this election, as uncanonical, and then, feeling obliged to make concessions to Venice, he chose Morosini, *motu proprio*, as patriarch on January 21, 1205. But before he set out for Constantinople Morosini passed through Venice and bound himself by a secret treaty to admit to the chapter of Saint Sophia only Venetian canons

and to make them promise that they would never elect any but a Venetian as patriarch.

The French clergy almost excluded from Constantinople betook themselves to the kingdom of Thessalonica where Boniface of Montferrat distributed to them churches and monasteries with a free hand. Nivelon de Chérisy, Bishop of Soissons, became archbishop of Thessalonica and the Cistercians of Locedio received the monastery of Corthiac (τοῦ Χορταίτου) near Thessalonica. Almost all the episcopal sees were filled in the same way. The oversight of Mount Athos was given by the papal legate to the bishop of Sebaste. With the aid of some knights he built a castle on the domain of Athos, from whence he sent against the monasteries veritable expeditions of pillage. To make him cease from such misconduct required the intervention of the emperor Henry and of Innocent III who had the bishop of Sebaste deposed and placed the monasteries under his own direct protection.

At Athens the archbishop, Michael Acominatus, who had defended his see-city against Otto de la Roche, abandoned his see. He was replaced in 1206 by the Latin archbishop Bérard, whose nomination was confirmed by the pope. Bérard took possession of the Parthenon, which was used as cathedral, and set up in it a chapter of canons on the model of Notre-Dame of Paris. A second Latin archbishop was installed at Thebes. The monastery Daphni on the road to Eleusis was presented by Otto de la Roche to his compatriots the Cistercians of Bellevaux. Later, about 1219, Benedict of Arezzo introduced in Greece the Franciscans. These founded houses in Thebes, in Negropont (Euboea) and even in Athens.

Thus the Latin church had become all-powerful in the principality of Morea. At the outset of the conquest William of Champelitte had established a chapter of French canons in the church of St. Andrew of Patras. These chose as archbishop the Burgundian Anthelme

who had been trained in the monastery of Cluny. Anthelme took the title Primate of the Morea. Geoffroi II de Villehardouin multiplied establishments in favour of the Latins,—a house of Templars at Andravida, Cistercian monasteries at Saracaz in the diocese of Corinth and at Verge in the diocese of Modon. Repeatedly, in 1210 and in 1225, the princes of Morea solicited the sending out of new Cistercian colonizers. The Franciscans, on their part, founded an important monastery at Clarenza. Finally at the division of 1208 each of the three military orders, the Hospitalers, the Knights Templar and the Teutonic Knights, and the Latin bishops received four feudal fiefs. To complete the conquest Geoffroi II wished to force the churches to join with their vassals in the attack on the Greek strongholds. On their refusal he had their possessions seized and defied the excommunication which was, a little later, reiterated on the intervention of the pope.

In their island possessions the Venetians acted in the same way. In Crete a Latin archbishop, with five suffragans, was established at Candia. The domains of the clergy were expected to contribute to the cost of the conquest and, as these charges fell ultimately on the Greek vassals, the new ecclesiastical régime quickly became unpopular. In the Cyclades, on the other hand, Marco Sanudo followed a quite different policy. He guaranteed to his subjects the practice of their religion and their rites. He confirmed the authority of the Greek archbishop of Naxos, as well as all the privileges of the priests and monks. He exempted the Basilian monasteries from all dues and by such conduct made himself very popular among the Greeks. Then, as the number of Latins increased, he asked the pope to send them a bishop. He built for them a cathedral in his *Kastro* (official residence) and established a chapter of six canons. The conduct of Sanudo toward the Greeks is an exception that deserves notice.

This summary sketch suffices to show what was the importance of the assumption by the Latins of the dignities and the property of the Greek church. Innocent III seems not to have been altogether hostile in principle to this assumption. He could have wished, however, that it might not have been systematic and general. On the other side, he tried to make the dependence of the new clergy as strict as possible in its relations with the Holy See and to stay the spoliation of the Greek church.

Cardinal Benoît de Sainte Suzanne, who had been sent as legate to Romania in 1205, was charged by the pope to settle the questions relative to the patriarchate of Constantinople and the secularization of ecclesiastical property. The legate undertook first to undo the effect of the secret treaty made between Morosini and Venice and to remove from the chapter of Saint Sophia its exclusively Venetian character. But Venice resisted and Morosini refused to recognize the French canons nominated by the legate. In 1209 the question was still pending. The status of the patriarch himself was settled by a papal bull of 1206. Far from lessening his rights the pope wished to make him his representative in the East. He accorded to the patriarch full disciplinary power over his church and even limited the number of appeals to Rome. The pope, therefore, recognized the autonomy of the patriarch of Constantinople from the disciplinary point of view and a Greek prelate would have found it possible to accept these conditions. Unhappily the occupation of the patriarchal throne by a foreigner made any sincere conciliation impossible.

Cardinal de Sainte Suzanne negotiated also for several months in regard to ecclesiastical property. He could not undo what had been done but he exerted himself to arrest the secularizing movement. By the treaty of March 17, 1207 made between the legate, the patriarch, the regent, Henry of Flanders, the knights and the people, the barons yielded to the church a fifth part of

their property and revenues. Commissaries nominated by the two parties were charged to make a survey of the empire so as to proceed to the division. But there were numerous instances of resistance, especially in the Morea. In 1210 at the second *Parlement* at Ravennica, with the emperor Henry presiding, the barons agreed to restore to the Church the secularized property and the Church, for its part, promised to pay the land tax and to recognize obligation to feudal service for the sons of native clerics.

But already the illusions of Innocent III as to the power which the Latin empire could bring to the support of the crusade had vanished. The recall of the legate Benoît de Sainte Suzanne in 1207 marks a change of policy on the part of the pope. He takes up again his project of a direct crusade and counts no longer on the support of Romania. Morosini died in 1211. Immediately a conflict about the succession broke out between the French clergy in Constantinople and the Venetian canons. Each of the two parties elected its own candidate, and, as no agreement was possible, the pope in 1213 sent to Constantinople a new legate, Cardinal Pelagius, Archbishop of Albano. Pelagius recognized as patriarch Gervais, Archbishop of Heraclea, the candidate of the emperor.

It is evident, then, what difficulties attended Innocent III in establishing some measure of order in the new Latin church of Romania. But, after all, was the principal good that was expected to come from the Constantinopolitan crusade going to be realized? In this domain, as in the others, the pope was destined to meet with disappointment, for, in spite of the instructions which he addressed to them, the Latin clergy were too often led to exact from the Greeks a union by force.

Innocent III had proposed at the outset to obtain from the Greeks a voluntary assent to union. The instructions given in 1205 to the legate, Benoît de Sainte Suzanne, are most conciliatory and he acquits himself of his mission

with moderation and tact. He treats with the Greek bishops as power with power and negotiates even with those of the empire of Nicea. He holds a conference with Michael Acominatus at Thessalonica and makes important concessions to him, admitting for instance the use of leavened bread for the Eucharist and considering the ritual differences as secondary. "I think," he says, "that diversity in ecclesiastical customs can do no harm to churches that have their root in a common belief, and that in itself it can constitute no schism."

Such was surely the thought of the pope and that is what is implied in the instructions sent on August 2, 1206 by Innocent III to the patriarch Morosini, who was opposed to the conciliatory policy of the legate. As to rites the pope counsels moderation and reserves to himself the final decision. He goes even so far as to decide that ordinations conferred by the Greek bishops are valid. The sole obligation for the Greek prelates is to make formal recognition of the authority of the Holy See. Further those who refuse this are to be deposed only after three summons. One should even wait for six months before replacing a fugitive dignitary. In Greek dioceses Greeks are to be nominated as far as possible, in mixed dioceses Latins; vacant Greek monasteries are to be given to Latin monks.

In the same spirit when Morosini complains in 1208 to the pope that some Greek bishops have indeed consented to take the oath of obedience but have refused to allow themselves to be consecrated according to the Latin rite, Innocent III replies that those who have been already consecrated should not be constrained to receive Latin unction. The new titularies alone must receive it. When the archbishop of Athens wishes to consecrate by force Theodore the Greek bishop of Negropont and on his refusal deposes him, the pope declares this deposition void.

The only condition on which the pope shows himself

inflexible is the taking of the oath exacted of every Greek bishop. This oath is taken according to feudal forms with hands joined in the hands of the representative of the pope. The bishop swears fidelity and obedience to the Roman church which he pledges himself to defend with all his power. He promises to respond when called to councils, to undertake the journey *ad limina* and to receive with due respect any legate from the Holy See. Lastly the name of the pope must be inscribed on the diptychs.

Such strict obedience is far removed from the régime of autonomy which was that of the Greek Church before 1054 and this is surely the most serious innovation that Innocent III introduced in the ecclesiastical status and the principal cause of the persistence of the schism. All the Greek bishops, indeed, do not show themselves intransigent. Many of them submit to take the oath and receive in exchange the confirmation of their former privileges, for instance the bishop of Rodosto in 1212. At the moment when Geoffroi de Villehardouin is about to take possession of Corinth the pope writes to him that if there is a Greek archbishop in the city he must try to bring him by gentle means to take the oath to the Apostolic See. If he refuses he is to be replaced by a Latin. So, too, in 1209 the legate confirmed the liberties of all Greek clergy in Thessalonica who declared that they submitted themselves to Roman jurisdiction.

Thus Innocent III admits in large measure the maintenance of the native clergy, but on the condition that these shall be as strictly subject to him as the Latin clergy. Such a clause made impossible any agreement with the Greek clergy who had remained independent of the Latins. And further, among the clergy subject to the conquerors passive resistance and even protests were frequent. In many places there were scenes of violence. At Daulis in Morea in 1212 the Latin archdeacon was struck and maltreated by the Greeks. It would seem

that the pope lost patience. Cardinal Pelagius, who was sent as legate to Constantinople in 1213 carried instructions much less conciliatory than those of his predecessor, and, because of his own aggressive character, he was only too ready to exceed them.

The mission of Pelagius, it seems, served only to increase the divergencies. By his pomp and ostentation he irritated the Greeks; by his acts of violence he ended by exasperating them. He was instructed to obtain the submission of the Greek clergy and he began by having the recalcitrants cast into prison, by affixing seals to the doors of their churches, by driving monks from their monasteries. Affairs quickly came to such a pass that the emperor Henry, becoming uneasy, intervened, had the churches reopened, released the prisoners and restored the monks. Then he proposed to the two parties a compromise. The Greeks who refused to recite the name of the pope in the liturgy were to pronounce at the close of each service a formula moulded on the imperial acclamation: *Innocentii Domini papae veteris Romae multos annos!* [6] The pope was to permit the Greeks to elect a patriarch of their own nation in view of the council to come.

It was under these conditions that Pelagius, in obedience to the pontifical instructions, promoted the gathering at Constantinople of a conference with the Greek clergy of the empire of Nicea. Evidently nothing could come of it. The delegate from Nicea, Nicolas Merasites, metropolitan of Ephesus, was received with honour at Constantinople, but he complains of his haughty greeting by Pelagius, who received him seated on a throne. Some lively and quite caustic words were exchanged, then, after a week's discussion they separated without having reached any result.

At the ecumenical council of the Lateran in 1215 there was not a single representative of the native Greek

[6] I. e. Long live Lord Innocent, Pope of Old Rome.

clergy and very few of the Latin bishops of Romania had taken the trouble to come. The council proclaimed that the Greeks were come back into the obedience of the Holy See. It was allowable for them to keep their rites and their special usages, but they were sharply reproached for the hatred that they had been constantly showing to the Latins as well as for their set purpose to rebaptize children who had received Latin baptism and to purify altars that had been used by Latin priests.

The situation did not improve under the successors of Innocent III. On one side the Latin clergy showed sentiments of independence toward Rome. The patriarch of Constantinople, Gervais, regarded himself as the pope of the East, sending out patriarchal legates and forbidding appeals to Rome. On the other side the relations between the Latin clergy and the natives became worse and worse. The correspondence of the thirteenth century popes is full of reproaches addressed to the Latin archbishops on their abuses of power and their violent acts. In 1224 Honorius III accuses the archbishop of Patras of having blinded certain Greeks, of having extorted money from them, and of having pillaged the churches. In 1232 Gregory IX complains that the archbishop of Crete has maltreated clerics, changed churches into taverns, absolved excommunicated persons for money, hindered appeals to Rome. Step by step as the Greeks of Johannes Vatatzes or from the principality of Epirus reoccupied districts the Latin bishops were forced to abdicate or to give place to the Orthodox. By the middle of the thirteenth century the Latin church of Romania was already in deep distress and, except in Morea and the Venetian possessions, the moment was coming when it would disappear. Of the work of the conquerors nothing was destined to endure, except the hatred in the heart of the Greeks.

III.

It is, in fact, from this period that the feelings of the Greeks toward the Occidentals take on a character of stubborn hostility that forebodes failure to every effort at reconciliation. It is in vain that men belonging to the élite of the two clergies come to agreement on formulas of compromise; it is in vain that danger from the Turks seems, from the fourteenth century on, to make union a patriotic duty. The Greek clergy in the mass and especially the monks draw back into a sullen nationalism. Their efforts cause all attempts at union to fail and make even the most solemn acts fruitless, as those of Lyons in 1273 and of Florence in 1438. In vain the emperor and the high clergy proclaim union; the people guided by the monks will have none of it.

From the beginning of the Latin empire the Greek clergy were in constant rebellion and found means of keeping in touch with the patriarch of Nicea who sent them secret instructions. Every attempt at union was already deeply unpopular, and in 1221 Johannes Apocaucus, metropolitan of Naupactus in the principality of Epirus, on learning that the emperor Theodore Lascaris was preparing to negotiate with Rome wrote to the patriarch of Nicea that he should dissuade him from it. It is curious to see the efforts that Michael Paleologus made in 1272 to induce the clergy to accept union. In a conference reported by Pachymeres he tries to show that the concessions demanded of him are of small importance. The recognition of the primacy of the pope is merely platonic, the appeals to Rome will not be numerous, the commemoration of the popes in the diptychs is a trifling matter in view of the dangers that menace the empire. The Greek church will retain its rites and its usages. But these arguments did not convince his hearers, and after eight years of effort Michael Paleologus was obliged in 1280 to denounce the union that he had himself accepted.

He died in 1282 excommunicated by the pope and regarded by his own subjects as a heretic.

It was especially during the long reign of Andronicus II, from 1282 to 1328, that the hostility against the Latins came to violent exhibition. If one may believe Guillaume d'Adam the monks at the time of his accession solemnly demanded of him five promises: to refuse all obedience to the Roman church; to curse the adepts of that church; never to oppose the religious practices of the Greeks; to curse and excommunicate his father who had died in the Roman faith; to deprive his father of burial. At his accession Andronicus II casts into prison the patriarch Johannes Veccus author of the union, and many of his partizans, drives the Preaching Friars from Constantinople, forces his wife and his daughter-in-law to abjure catholicism and accords his entire support to the monks.

The reign of Andronicus III, from 1328 to 1341, still further strengthens the monastic party. From then on the high clergy, beginning with the patriarch of Constantinople are recruited especially from the monasteries. The Hesychast controversy, a true movement of mysticism analogous to that which stirs the West at the same period, marks the triumph of the ascetics over the humanists. The monastic party from that time on becomes all powerful in the East and confronts Rome as the fortress of Greek nationalism.

So when in 1334 Andronicus III, terrified at the advance of the Ottomans, seeks to renew negotiations with the pope it is already too late and his efforts are as sterile as will be those of his successors, of Johannes V, Manuel II, Johannes VIII, Constantine XII. From the fourteenth century on the Occidentals were aware of the feelings they inspired among the Greeks. "They fear us and hate us with all their hearts", Petrarch writes of them to Urban V in 1366. He regards them as worse than the Turks. All the evidences show that a good part of the

Greek clergy had in the fifteenth century come to prefer the domination of the Turks to union with Rome. The sultans understood how to exploit this feeling with skill. A report sent to the pope in 1430 states that throughout the Christian territories conquered by the Turks "archbishops of Constantinople consecrated by the patriarch are sent with the permission of the infidels". This same patriarch sends "into the Eastern districts" fifteen archbishops, each of whom has under his orders four or even as many as twenty bishops.[7] So from 1436 on there grew up a sort of concordat between the patriarch and the Turks in regard to the Christian countries occupied by them. This curious piece of information explains why after 1453 the Greek clergy accepted so readily the Turkish rule. Ottoman conquest seemed to them less burdensome than Roman domination.

It can then be asserted that the inflexible opposition of the Eastern churches to any union with Rome is the direst result of that ill-fated experiment, the crusade of Constantinople. The ancient compromise between the two churches had been destroyed by the schism of 1054, but it might have come to life again if the spirit of conquest had not urged the Occidentals to impose by force on the Greeks an adhesion which, if it was to prove durable, required a free assent. Such is the cause of the misunderstanding that, for the last nine centuries has separated the East and the West. But nine centuries are but a short span in the life of humanity and none can affirm that a new chapter will not be added to the story, so abounding in sudden turns of fortune, of the relations between the Churches of the East and that of Rome.

[7] Jorga, *Notices et Extraits pour Servir à l'histoire des Croisades*, Fourth Series, pp. 32–33. Bucharest, 1915.

The Spiritual Challenge to Democracy

By Shailer Mathews,
Dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago

Democracy is threatened by success. The supreme test to which it is now exposed is that of a conquering ideal. In the full sense of the term, it is true, democracy has not yet arrived, but as one recalls the history of the past century and a half, the inevitableness of its triumph is apparent. In politics we have seen the development of democratic ideals, which, partially shaped in Switzerland, Holland and England, found distinct constitutional expression in America. For the rights of the people, the men of the eighteenth century were willing to die. In the Bill of Rights of England, in the Bills of Rights of the American Colonies and the states of the American Union, and in the Bills of Rights of the French Revolution we can see the steady growth of the responsibility of the government to the governed, of the freedom of the individual in thought, business and speech. In it has found ever fuller expression the sublime confidence that given free speech, men who think alike will ultimately act alike, and that a minority can safely trust the majority. This development warrants the prophecy that its trend is one of political inevitability. Even China and Russia, whatever else the future may have in store for them, await the approaching end of class privilege, irresponsible government, and the supremacy of militarism.

Nor is it alone in the field of politics that the demo-

cratic leaven is working. It appears in our social institutions. The continuation of war is possible only with the consent of the workmen. Through their labor organizations the wage earners are ever more their own masters, and the drift of legislation in Europe and America is steadily towards the recognition and the extension of their rights. True, even more than in politics, democracy in the industrial world is incomplete as yet, but the world will never succumb to a self-imposed authority in state or industry. The world-war in begetting a world-spirit has begotten a new world-order.

Obviously the test to which such a triumphant movement will be subjected is very different from that set it by the men and institutions of a hundred and fifty years ago. Those times called for courage requisite for an untried adventure in the search for political equality and social rights. Those rights have been in no small measure now attained. Autocracy, feudalism, irresponsible capitalism, have yielded or compromised. The challenge set to democracy now is spiritual. Its test will be moral. Now that it has gained power it must learn to use power. Earlier democracies have so often led to military monarchies or to the exploitation of the masses by their leaders, that in this moment democracy may well take account of its spiritual task.

But the choice of words and terms needs attention. We must avoid political scholasticism. Every ideal must work itself out through flesh and blood into social movements, institutions, and the organization of the interests and activities of real people. Whoever during these critical months in reestimating the powers of America, England and France questions whether the things for which our fathers stood are really to endure, realizes that he has to deal not with abstract and academic theories, but with human passions ranging from the most sublime to the most selfish. If democrats are to achieve real democracy, they must avoid the pitfalls into which

so many of their predecessors have fallen. It is the spirit that quickens. The only institutions that show themselves capable of permanent development are those which embody genuinely personal, spiritual qualities. Democracy, if it is to succeed, must be seen to be more than a political device, or a melting pot. It is a tendency in the social growth of real people who arrive at one stage of social evolution only to push on to another. To this tendency all nations will in time contribute, until the outcome is vastly greater and, if only spiritual forces are not suppressed, vastly nobler than any speculation can determine or foresee. The coming social order will not be bound by any *a priori* programs, but if properly inspired, will be the cooperative expression of the spiritual ideals and the moral self-control of democrats subordinating state and industry to personal well-being.

I

A triumphing democracy must resist the temptation to substitute centralized efficiency for personal values.

Under the stress of war, we hear much about the military inefficiency of democracies. The criticism may have been overstated, but it certainly is well grounded. Democracies like the English, Canadian, Australasian and American have shown themselves ill prepared for sudden war. But this is not wholly to their discredit. The fact that a democracy has not headed up in military efficiency, but in larger opportunities for individual initiative is a tribute to its success rather than to its failure. A nation may easily overestimate the idealism of its neighbors and become a victim of a myoptic optimism. But such a nation is further advanced in the direction of the real goal of social evolution than is another which has subordinated individual initiative to state action and prompt following of a war policy. A centralized efficiency which loses the individual in the whole is not difficult to organize, but, if the evolution of the last one

hundred and fifty years has any meaning whatever, is an efficiency contrary to nature. The Roman Empire, its supreme illustration, fell because of its efficiency. A superimposed government had deprived the individual of his initiative. A nation always in arms, growing by annexations and indemnities, is no leader in genuine spiritual progress.

The fact that under the stress of war democracy has shown itself capable of facing, albeit slowly, the tasks of war, is a testimony to its unappreciated power to meet new needs. But such success contains a danger. Organization for military efficiency is not the goal of democracy. Such efficiency conceivably might make a democracy an organized entity that would lay its hand relentlessly upon the life of its subjects and gain national power at the expense of the individual. That danger challenges us today. We must not lose the fundamental aim of democracy at the moment when we are developing a military efficiency in the interest of self-defense.

Nor is this danger merely hypothetical. Already those who seek industrial centralization are urging that a state must be an economic as well as a political unit; that it must have military and political forces back of commercial undertakings; that it must so organize itself as to demand, if need be by armed intervention, national advantages in international commerce. Were such a program to be carried out, there could be but one outcome: democracy would become capitalistic imperialism. Democratic forms might continue as in Rome under Augustus, but it is hard to see how a state organized as a commercial unit under the control of financial masters, efficiently centralized for economic warfare, would be a democracy. It is far better to suffer some degree of economic inefficiency than to lose freedom, personal initiative, spiritual uplift, freedom of thought and speech. The temptation to minimise this danger is heightened because of the exigencies of the present war. The world

of democracy is enforcing an armed quarantine. But such a success forces democracies a plane lower than their best ideals. It is all the more imperative, therefore, that we guard ourselves against the temptation to believe that such highly centralized efficiency must be a permanent attribute of the democratic movement. Quarantines pass when epidemics disappear. To perpetuate them in politics would be as dangerous as to perpetuate them in the case of disease. It is thrilling to see democracy gathering history into a world-wide defense of its achievements. But it will be a nobler and a finer thing to see this same democratic movement subordinating extreme efficiency to the true ideal of democracy, the development of institutions in which individuals may cooperate without losing their own personal initiative and spiritual value. We cannot make the world safe for democracy except as democrats continually reconsecrate themselves to personal and social rather than to economic and political efficiency. The goal of democracy is not the efficient state, but the socially-minded individual. The real measure of its greatness will be found in peace rather than in war, in social justice rather than in commercial expansion. Its true prophets are not the soldier or the concessionaire, but the teacher and the social reformer. Its great task is to show that individuals can co-operate for their common good without destroying freedom of individual initiative and self-control.

II

Again, a successful democracy must avoid materialism.

What shall it profit democracy if it gain the whole world and lose its own soul? In every industrial struggle can be heard the call to the proper perspective of goods. Economic gain is not the final test of democracy. There is something nobler than wealth — the soul of a people, the ideals of individual men and women. Economic

efficiency may be the accompaniment and even the outcome of a proper adjustment of social institutions. But the relative worth of nations cannot be expressed in per-capita statements as to wealth or in trade balances. The loss of individual freedom, of simplicity in life, of regard for honor, truth, and goodness, is too high a price to pay for prosperity. Some sort of industrial loss may well be endured as the price of personality. Far more valuable than complete industrial organization and technical accomplishments is the spiritual value of the people who are in industry. Human welfare, rather than increased production and capitalistic autocracy limited by strikes, should be the goal of all industrial reorganization.

Nor does this in any sense involve a refusal to decrease waste, to readjust various branches of industry and to seek an economic efficiency that is not opposed to the conditions of spiritual progress. We have already made some conquests by this truth. Many evils have been corrected, — child labor, the overworking of women, the exploitation of human life in long hours and low wages are all being rectified. The exploitation of human life becomes more difficult year by year. But in a moment when democracy is reorganizing itself under the stress of war, the temptation increases to handle human beings as cogs of a great machine whose business it is to increase material resources. In a moment of crisis it is true that we may be compelled to choose courses of action which run counter to the ideals of peace, but we should see to it that such a crisis does not establish precedents for normal living. The state is more than a big business. To treat the state as primarily concerned in furthering its own economic gain is to prostitute democracy.

The church would be untrue to its mission if it did not seek to prevent this lapse of democracy into materialism. But before it can be thoroughly effective, it must itself come into larger sympathy with the ideals of

democracy. Democracy is so modern an achievement as to have had as yet very limited influence in the shaping up of religious thought and institutions. The vast majority of Christians are living under church organizations which are undemocratic, and in some cases have repeatedly set themselves against democratic movements. Even in church organizations which are without hierarchies, religious thought has not been sufficiently democratized. Theology is still monarchical in its terminology and its concepts. True, while ecclesiastical authority is buttressed by a belief in its power to control post-mortem conditions of men, the contradiction between democratic tendencies in society and the church are less in evidence. But it cannot be overlooked that the group in which democratic ideals are at the present time most effective, namely, the wage earning class, is not heartily allied with religious democracies. Not only is there the more or less overstated distrust of Protestant churchmen as representatives of the capitalist class, but there is also a lack of adjustment between the religious thinking of the church and the socialist or the labor union movements. The next few years are likely to show clearly whether the adjustment of Christianity to democracy will be within the limits set by church organizations. It will be a great calamity if such should not be the case. Democracy is bound to have some form of idealistic philosophy and if the churches cannot supply its needs, it will turn elsewhere. What the democratic movement unregulated by Christian precedents and ideals can accomplish is to be seen among peoples who, like the Bohemians, have abandoned the Church as they developed the conceptions of individual liberty.

The obligation which the church faces here cannot be met ecclesiastically. Even though Christian churches should become far less anachronistic in thought and organization than they are at the present time, the influence of the Gospel will not be limited by church creeds

and orthodoxies. The ethics of Jesus, his faith in a loving God, as well as in a God of justice, his insistence upon the superiority of the personal over the economic, have long since passed beyond the limits of any ecclesiasticism, and, too often unrecognized, have become a part of the democratic tendency itself. The church ought to seize upon and adapt itself to this fact. The preacher of righteousness should be possessed of a contagious idealism that shall spread beyond the limits of his own immediate congregation into the social movements of the day. Nothing is more depressing than to see men who ought to be our spiritual leaders reverting to Jewish apocalypses, making diagrams for the study of the book of Daniel, finding "tanks" and aeroplanes in Ezekiel and foretelling the end of the world. The Gospel ought to be spiritual leaven. A triumphant democracy is impatient with leaders who have stopped leading. The spiritual needs of today will not be met by champions of outgrown conditions. If our clergymen cannot meet this present test, the church will join other outgrown institutions, and democracy will be that much the poorer, and its spiritual movement will be less rapid. The materialistic forces which are so much in evidence in certain phases of socialism and in business will gain undue importance, and a successful democracy will have lost something of its fervor for social order and individual liberty. Indeed any historical movement that is indifferent to the supreme spiritual forces of the universe is likely to grow impersonal, a devotee to the more unworthy pleasures of life, a champion of physical coercion, and an advocate of the survival of the strong at the expense of the weak.

III

A successful democracy must learn to give justice rather than to get rights.

In the eighteenth century the democratic movement was a sort of replevin of natural rights lost by "natural

men" to the state. Under the influence of its theories, it believed that some time in the distant past men had possessed rights which, with or without their consent, had been taken from them by kings and nobles. They therefore heroically struggled to get these rights back. It is of small account that their philosophy was historically inaccurate and that the beatific "state of nature" never existed. The real issue which the men of the eighteenth century faced was that of getting what they believed to be rights from classes which wished to monopolize them. This acquisitive tendency of democracy of course continues. It is in the appeal of the socialist and labor leader. It serves to keep the masses of the workers in an attitude of mind of which strikes are a legitimate outcome.

Some students fear that there is not the same enthusiasm for democracy today that there was in the early part of the nineteenth century. All comparative statements of the sort are dangerous, but even if such an assertion were correct, it might involve something very different from what appears upon its surface. The struggle for rights as a part of the democratic movement, if it be not complemented by the determination to share rights, may be as brutal and as selfish as in the case of aristocrats. To share rights is to give justice. Will democrats learn this lesson? Will democrats who have sought to get justice be ready to give justice? Until an affirmative answer to this question is possible, democracy will be only incomplete. The mastery of material forces and the development of cooperative efficiency in economic production, insensible to the worth of the things of the spirit, may leave a democracy brutal and acquisitive.

The situation in politics is at this point somewhat in advance of that in industry, but at the same time we have yet to work out a satisfactory adjustment between the two aspects of the democratic movement. Political democracy

is only too readily exploited by the masters of capital. The democracy which the labouring man wants is the right to have a recognized share in the control of his economic situation comparable with his share in the productive process. While there has been undeniable progress in the human side of industry, the relations of wage earner and employer are still too much analogous to those existing between the aristocracy and the Third Estate in the eighteenth century. Nothing like a stable equilibrium of rights has yet been reached. Too frequently the interest of wage earners is respected only when they threaten trouble. Organized labour is by no means beyond criticism, and it needs to recognize the claims of justice to others as truly as do employers. But distribute blame for economic strife as one may, it yet remains true that the ideal of democracy is that power is a trust rather than a right. Unless we are frankly to adopt neo-Darwinianism as the basis of social relations, industry no more than politics can rest upon the coercion of the less favored. Privilege is a monopolized right that has lost its sense of social obligations. It must be shared with others. In our industrial order it is only the part of wisdom for the representatives of capital to take the first move in the approach towards labour.

It is always unfortunate when a democracy depends upon the enforced rather than the voluntary extension of rights, for justice in such situations is not really grounded in moral idealism. Such a democracy is in danger of degenerating into a social order the central principle of which is the subjection of the weak to the strong. The Christian ideal of a democracy is that of a social order in which rights are extended not because of fear of compulsion, but because of that recognition of the claim of others which is the Christian ideal of fraternity.

How far we are meeting this test we cannot fully say. It is undeniable, however, that altruism is present in our social thinking, and that democrats of one country are

willing to sacrifice in the interests of democrats of another. One spiritual challenge of today is to believe that it is as noble to give rights as it is to fight for rights. Democratic idealism must proceed along the sacrificial way, for it needs something more than the mere getting of the things it wants. Even in the midst of war, our noblest ambition is to establish justice not by the force of arms, necessary though it may be, but rather by impregnating the course of history with those ideals which shall lead men and women to present themselves as living sacrifices to the welfare of other persons. Democracy, as individuals, needs to be taught that it is more blessed to give than it is to get.

IV

A successful democracy must rely upon contagious spiritual idealism rather than upon force.

In time of war, to realize this truth we need, as it were, to stand outside the circle of our immediate tasks. At first glance, of course, it seems almost axiomatic to the follower of Jesus. War, with its reduction of the individual to an instrument of strategy, is in itself no training for individual initiative. The spirit of Calvary is certainly not the spirit of militarism. The pacifist is correct when he holds that the ideals of Jesus are the ideals of peace. No exegetical ingenuity can make them those of Pilate. The Son of Man did not come to destroy life, but to save it. The cross can never be beaten into the sword. The kingdom of God is a family, not an empire.

But in our practical approach to life, this absolute pacifism breaks down. The idealism of Jesus becomes a goal rather than a description of human life. If human history were a logical adjustment of abstract thought, the dream of the pacifist, like that of the philosophical anarchist, might well be taken as supreme. Indeed, paradoxical as it sounds, it sometimes seems as if un-

practical idealists were the worst enemies of their ideals. For history is not composed of abstractions; it is made of the activities of men. Ideals work only as they draw to themselves and govern the practicable efforts of concrete human lives in which they are embodied. Social evolution does not leap into Utopias. It must walk towards them. When in the progress of history ideals are partially embodied in human institutions which preserve the more spiritual values, their significance is to be judged by the general direction of social movements and by the power of men to protect their imperfectly idealistic achievements. If the curves of the progress of various social groups were identical or even parallel, the need of force to protect progress of the one against the other would not be felt. There would be brotherhood between groups as there is brotherhood between the membership of groups. But as history is actually made, different social groups are too often in conflict with others. The less Christian such a group is, the more will it endanger the welfare of the others. When such less Christian groups threaten the existence of the institutions of a more completely Christianized group the duty of self-protection becomes an element in the larger obligation to conserve progress towards the ideal. That is the meaning of government as it attempts to protect honest men from criminals. It is the sole justification of war.

Assuming that democracy is a further advance towards Christian idealism than is a militaristic autocracy, war in defense of democracy is a less evil than the complete destruction of a society which embodies democracy. In no other way can the spirit of love, which at bottom is the extension of privilege and justice to others, express itself. Non-resistance on the part of individuals is at times the inevitable expression of the spirit of Christ. But a refusal of a social group to protect and extend to its descendants, even by force, the incalculable blessings of group morality would mean the end of

social progress itself. Christian colonists, for example, seeking to embody Christian ideals in a state ought beyond question to treat savages in a Christian fashion, with justice and with kindness. But if despite such treatment the savages plan to massacre the colonists, there can be no moral doubt as to the obligation to prevent the triumph of savagery by an appeal to force. The same duty is met where a nation sees its higher social order threatened by another nation. Love is not social passivity.

But such appeals to force can be justified only when genuinely defensive. Self-protection is not to be confounded with military propaganda. Love can spread itself only by love. Even so precious a good as democracy is not to be forced upon nations by arms. It is one thing for colonists to defend their social order from destruction by savages, it is another thing to attempt to force civilization upon savages by killing them. It is one thing for democracy to defend itself and its institutions against an autocracy that believes that justice is a civil and not an international virtue, and another thing to attempt to make an autocracy a democracy by force. Spiritual growth is to be carried forward by spiritual means. An attempt to carry even so supreme a good as political liberty to other nations by conquest has seldom failed, as in the case of Bonaparte, to result in a prostitution of high ideals to reliance upon military efficiency.

The world now stands, in war, face to face with this supreme test. The justification of such an appeal to force stops at the limits of self-protection. To carry it further into a crusade to extend democracy on a military basis is to give up reliance upon the spiritual values which democracy involves, and to revert to the program of the enemies of democracy.

It is the business of the church in this sad moment to preserve the soul of democracy from the lust of power which its success engenders. Victory for democracy

should mean opportunity for free political growth according to the wishes of undemocratic peoples, rather than the forcible conversion of such peoples.

This is indeed the supreme challenge, for a conquering democracy. It must move forward step by step away from reliance upon force as a means of expansion to a recognition of the fact that spiritual effects must rest upon spiritual causes. To give justice is peculiarly the duty of the victor. To clear our minds of all lust for revenge is our supreme duty as Christian citizens. The course of social evolution cannot be determined by weight of armaments, but by the approach to the ideals of Jesus applied to society as truly as to individuals. A Christianity that inculcates any lower social ideals than that of the giving of justice and the practice of fraternity between nations is untrue to its highest mission. A democracy bereft of this idealism is salt that has lost its savor. The God we worship and the divine principles we seek to embody in democracy demand a wholehearted devotion to spiritual aims that are moral rather than merely scientific, fraternal rather than coercive.

V

The long view of history shows clearly the direction which human life is taking. That tendency is not towards the mitigated brutality of slavery or the civilized brutality of international aggression. It is towards human brotherhood. The rapidity of this movement will be judged as one compares the few thousand years during which civilization in the modern sense of the word has been known, with the long stretch of human life upon the world and the uncalculated ages during which life has been struggling forward to its present accomplishments. But whether we judge it slow or rapid—and in this long view its rapidity seems marvellous — the tendency is undeniably away from submission to geographic and merely economic forces towards the supremacy of

the free personality as represented in the goal set humanity by Jesus Christ, and as gradually embodied in democracy.

In the faith which this spiritual tendency begets, and with the courage born of this faith, democracies, with their enlarging embodiment of the spiritual forces in human life, may face their new and unprecedented tasks. We shall protect our developing democracy by force of arms, but we shall expect its ultimate triumph through the socializing of good will.

Let those who believe in God and the power of the gospel of Jesus wholeheartedly give themselves to insuring the ability of democrats to meet the challenge of the present age.

Christianity and the Science of Religion.[1]

By David S. Cairns, D.D.

The development of the Science of Religion during the last century was at first regarded by the earnestly religious mind of the time with suspicion, and indeed with a good deal of apprehension. The earnestly religious mind is very often a deeply conservative mind. For since all true religion has a strongly emotional element in it, it must needs be deeply attached to the past. Religious men who come of religious men and women find no dearer name for God than the time honoured name, "The God of my fathers." It is only the minority who combine with this veneration for the past the spirit of him who said, "After the fashion which they call a heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers." Moreover, the initial stages of the development of the Science of Religion were largely in the hands of great scholars who, although they were often possessed by a deep religious enthusiasm, had little sympathy with the traditional catholic and evangelical faith. Hence the Science of Religion was at first believed by many devout souls to have in it something dangerous to the faith by which they lived.

But wider and more accurate knowledge is more and more rebuking this fear, and once more teaching the lesson that it is a profound mistake to take care of the truth. The truth is perfectly able to take care of itself. It is true that in the Science of Religion much is as yet

[1]The substance of this article was first given at Leicester, England, as the Carey Lecture.

wrapped in profound obscurity. The first impression of the student who makes acquaintance with the new science is, that it is very doubtful whether it can rightfully be called a science at all. What is he to make of this vast accumulation of detail about savage rights and customs, these wild dissolving Pantheons and Valhallas of polytheism, and these sharp contradictions of intellectual belief and ethical type shown by the later prophetic and legal religions. What is there in common between the Moslem warriors of the early days of Islam, and the yellow robed monk missionaries of Buddhism?

But as the student persists in his inquiries he gradually begins to see the dim outlines of order emerging in the immense chaos. He sees forming a gradual consensus of opinion among the experts as to what religion really is, and is able under their guidance to reach the assured conviction that there is unity in the whole wonderful story, and that there are constant elements in all the religions without exception. He begins, moreover, to see that instead of shaking the fundamental verities, the Science of Religion is deepening and strengthening their foundations, and throwing new and hopeful light on the very nature of the Christian Gospel itself. Yet that there are certain dangers involved in the assimilation of the new knowledge, I would not deny. This article is a brief survey of both the gains and the chief dangers of the new science.

First of all then, I would say that the Science of Religion has brought with it a great access of strength to faith by its demonstration that religion is an absolutely universal thing. Research is making it plain that there does not exist to-day, and that never throughout human history has there existed, a people without some kind of religion.[2] This is a massive fact which surely of itself

[2]If there are exceptions to this sweeping statement, and personally I do not know of any, they are so trifling as to be practically negligible. Every nation has a religion of some kind or other. This

proves that religion is an essential element in human nature: something that at the lowest is on a level with art and with morality. The demonstration of that is surely a very great gain for the positive life of mankind. It implies that, as a notable scholar in the Science of Religion has said, "man is incurably religious." But it may be said that this is of little value unless we proceed to define what we mean by Religion. Here too, I believe, there is a growing consensus of opinion as to what in all its innumerable manifestations religion fundamentally is. Religion, to quote a recent scientific manual on the subject, is "the worship of Higher Powers from a sense of need." The older definitions of religion, those of Hegel, Kant and even Schleiermacher, which last comes nearest to that which I have given, are being practically superseded or included in the new definitions which are based on a much wider induction of the facts than was possible to these earlier thinkers. The modern definition of Religion which we find in the textbooks on the Science of Religion all tend to emphasize the fact that Religion on its human side is an enterprise of the whole nature of man, and not simply of his intellect and emotions. Religion is man's protest and appeal against the indignities and sorrows of this present life, to a higher, and unseen, and a governing world. With this world man seeks through Religion to enter into alliance that he may win its succour, and share its life, and give himself to its aim. M. Auguste Sabatier has put all this for us in a pregnant definition: "Religion," he says, "is a prayer for life." I believe that there is a very great consensus of evidence behind these words, and that here we have the root of the matter. In this disclosure of the true nature of Religion, we get the second great contribution which the Science of Religion has made towards the

---

does not, of course, mean that there are no men in whom religion is dead, or that there are no classes within a nation who have been turned aside from religion by historical causes.

better understanding and the fuller possession of the Christian Gospel. It is with the development of this line of thought that this article is now mainly concerned.

"Religion is a prayer for life." If that be so, what is the Christian revelation but the greatest answer to prayer on human record. But again if this be true, then the vast disclosure of the needs of the human heart in the story of human religion throughout all the world, and throughout all historic time, must needs throw light upon the divine answer; for surely, the answer of God must be relevant to the real needs of his creatures. We must think in more spacious terms than we have been wont to do of the Christian revelation in the light of the context which the Science of Religion has disclosed to us. There is here a great and rich new field of inquiry opening before us, into which we are called to enter and take possession. I do not think that as yet this has been ever adequately attempted or even envisaged by Christian thought. I shall not attempt to do more here than indicate in the broadest outlines how the method of comparison may be wrought out.

It has been already said that amid the immeasurable variety of the phenomena of religion, closer scrutiny discovers certain great universal and persistent elements, which are present in every religion and which endure throughout its entire historical development. Every religion, animistic, polytheistic, henotheistic, prophetic, legal, and redemptive, believes in an Unseen Ruling World, which is either friendly or which may be made friendly to the devout worshipper. This is undoubtedly the basal thought of religion, and therefore the most important thing in all religion is its conception of God. It is a deeply impressive thing to find everywhere this ineradicable faith in an Unseen Ruling World. Living as he does in the midst of tremendous physical forces man yet invariably believes in an Unseen World which is mightier than he. The savage, with the firm earth heav-

ing around him, the sailor, in the heart of a typhoon, the soldier of to-day, with high explosive shell breaking around him, all instinctively pray to something or someone whom they feel to be mightier than the mightiest physical power; one who is either friendly to them, or who may be made friendly by their prayers. It is this conviction, instinct, intuition, call it what you will, that is basal in all religion.[3]

It is conceived of in many different ways. The savage thinks of it most often in terms of the spirits of his ancestors; the polytheistic religions in terms of their heirarchies of gods; and the prophetic, in the main, in terms of the one Sovereign Lord of all; but always there is this faith in a being or in beings who are all powerful, and yet who are inaccessible to the senses of men, though in some unknown way they can hear and answer prayer.

Sovereign Power and reality are essential elements in the conception of this Unseen World. "Power belongeth unto God." The history of religion should be a warning to the many who to-day are seeking to solve the terrible problems of our time on the basis of belief in a God limited by something external to Himself. Apparent limit there may be, but it must be a limit self-imposed by the Sovereign Lord.

The second and constant element in all religions is the conception of a Supreme Good. By the very constitution of his being, man must not only believe in a Ruling Power, but must also necessarily seek a Supreme Good.

But this good is envisaged by him in very many different ways and all these ways are reflected in the many coloured story of religion. The lower religions set their true Good, as we should have expected, in the world of the senses. The savage man seeks from the Supreme Powers over all protection from fire, famine, flood and

[3]I am indebted for this analysis of the nature of Religion to my friend, Prof. W. P. Paterson, who has wrought it out in a striking passage in his *Rule of Faith.*

the wild beasts around him. He seeks for victory over his enemies, and for the multiplication of children, who may serve him in the struggle for bare existence, and for a fuller life. He seeks too, as do all religions alike, for deliverance from disease and death. The higher religions seek for redemption from the whole earthly system. They seek not only a better life in the earthly environment, but they seek a better environment than the present earthly life. But all the way up it is Life that they seek for, the enrichment and expansion of their own personal life or of that larger life of the community and of humanity with which they growingly identify their own. It is impossible here to illustrate this in detail, but illustrations of the principle might be gathered almost without limit from the great open field of religion, as it is brought before us in the textbooks and encyclopaedias and monographs of the science. Religion, if it is anything at all, is "a prayer for life."

> " 'Tis life of which our nerves are scant,
> 'Tis Life, O Life, for which we pant,
> More life and fuller, this we want."

The appeal of religion for life is made to that higher world which possesses it, and therefore in this prayer there is implicitly involved the idea of a kinship of the worshipper with that Unseen World.

We come now to the third universal and constant element in all religion, and that is the method or the way in which the worshipper believes he is able to enter into friendly relations with the Unseen Ruling World.

This, again, is conceived of in very many different ways. Savage religions believe that they can effect the necessary alliance by gifts, by sacrificial meals, by flatteries, and by petitions. Polytheistic religions lay stress on a more highly developed cultus: they have priesthoods, and temples, and an elaborate ritual praxis. Legal religions again have their code of divinely or-

dained laws, and religions of redemption have their ascetic practices and monastic orders, or their purely spiritual worship and devotion of the heart and life. Always there is, therefore, a method, a law, and a way, something which closes the circuit between man and God, something which effects the vital union through which the life and power of the Unseen World come down to men, and lifts them out of their sorrowful and needy state into the life of divine favour. Sometimes this Way or Praxis takes a ritual form. Sacrificial gifts, offerings of expiation, ordinances meant to manifest and effectuate the divine grace, are some among the many forms of this Way of approach to God. Or, again, in a more spiritual type of religion, the Way takes the form of a divinely revealed law of life, but the aim in all cases is to remove obstacles to the union of the life of the worshipper with the life of the Heavenly World.

Such then, are the three great constants in all religions: the three universal and permanent elements in that continuous prayer for life, which has always ascended from the soul of humanity to God. That these elements are found in all religions is not an invention of Christian apologetics. The evidence for them lies in all the manuals and encyclopaedias of the Science of Religion, and can be verified by any student for himself.

II

Now let us turn from the human prayer for life to that which we believe is the Divine answer to that prayer. Where shall we get an account of the essence of Christianity which will carry us at once to the heart of the matter and give us the essence of the Gospel? We cannot, I believe, do better than go to the Fourth Gospel for such an account. It is the Book which of all others may be regarded as the culmination of the entire course of revelation. If not actually quite the latest in date of the New Testament writings, it is certainly the latest of

its great writings. It represents the climax of the central stream of development of New Testament thought. It comes, I believe, from the beloved disciple himself. In the closing discourses of our Lord we enter the holiest place of all. Here, if anywhere, shall we find expressed the innermost genius and soul of the Christian faith, the answer to the universal prayer of humanity. We find that answer in the words of our Lord: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life, no man cometh unto the Father but by Me."

(1) The primary thing in this saying is found in the words, "I am the Truth." The fact that the Way is put before the Truth is due simply to the fact that it is an answer to the question, "How know we the Way?" But the primary thing in the Christian revelation, as in all religions, is the idea of God, which necessarily determines everything else in the religion, both in its worship and in its morality. The fundamental religious need of the world has just before been expressed in the words of Philip, "Lord shew us the Father and it sufficeth us," and Christ has already dealt with this by His answer, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." He now reiterates that central and vital affirmation by saying, "I am the Truth." Behind that prayer of Philip we have the primitive, enduring, universal thing in human nature, which has lavished all the sacrifices and built all the temples and set in motion all the great tides of religious emotion and religious thought which have played so mighty a part in human history. Philip here is uttering the deepest need of the human race, the desire for knowledge of God. For, as we have seen, the determining thing in every religion is its conception of God. Men know well that in order to win enduring life they must first pierce through all the world of appearance to Reality. They must know the truth about God before they can root their lives in Real-

ity. If they do not get through to Reality, they know that their lives must, in the end, be swallowed up in the great *maelstrom* of illusion and mortality. In the words, "I am the Truth," Christ is plainly saying, "I am Reality: know Me, and you will know God." Every mind that feels deeply and that thinks truly has in it an undying hunger to get out of the flux of the relative and the illusory to the absolute truth of things. Is it not this desire to take refuge in the All Powerful One which is at the heart of religion? Power, surely, can in the end of the day only inhere in Reality.

The central Christian conviction is that this unchanging Reality has been manifested to us in history in the Personality of our Lord, that here, as the schoolman said, we have the *ens realissimum* of the universe, that the truest thought we can frame of God is that He is an Almighty Christ, that the Eternal Father has been finally revealed in the Eternal Son.

Many are apt to-day to read the story of the great Christological controversy of the first Christian centuries with a measure of impatience and tedium. So long as we look at the mere dialectic externals of it this is inevitable. But when we realize the soul of it, the thing that the first theologians of the Church were really standing for, the whole history becomes transformed. They had seen the Man Jesus. He had come into their lives as a heavenly vision of faith and hope and love, scattering the morning from His hands.

> "Flowers laugh before thee in their beds
> And fragrance in thy footing treads."

Was this radiant vision a dream only? Was it possible in that hard and brutal world of fire and steel and blood to believe that these things were mightier than the tremendous display of physical force which Rome could wield, or the corrosive power of the intellect of the Greek, or were they part of the enduring substance of the world

mightier and more enduring than anything else beside? It is one thing to admire and love the Jesus of history. But it is another and a harder thing to cross the gulf which separates the individual life from the vast Whole, and to say with Athanasius, "I know that this Jesus is the God Who made Heaven and Earth." When we realize that this is the real issue, we can feel the splendour of the faith and moral energy that could affirm that Christ was Divine, that could believe, and against all odds and difficulties could maintain its belief, that in the soul of it the universe was Christ-like through and through.

It is substantially only another form of the same great issue that is before us to-day. In the first ages the form which that question took was the question as to whether Christ was truly divine. To-day the same question comes up in a new form. "Is the vast mysterious Being, the Source and Maintainer of such a world as ours, absolutely revealed in Him who spoke the Sermon on the Mount and Who freely gave His life on Calvary? Can we pass with security from this single human life to the ultimate meaning and constitution of the great Whole of Reality, and assert also that it is Christ-like through and through, that when we touch Jesus we touch Almighty God?" It is surely quite clear that the great world around us to-day does not believe this, otherwise its social and international life would not be what they are. Has the Church faith, while the old aeon is sinking in blood, to take possession of the new aeon in the spirit of the first heroic age of the faith? Future history swings and turns on that tremendous issue. In any case the words, "I am the Truth," the ultimate nature of things, stand there as the answer of God to the prayer of the world for knowledge of the nature and purpose of the One ultimate Power and Reality.

(2) We have seen that all religions, without exception, have faith that there is a Way to God if man can

but find it. They each believe that they have found that Way. Jesus Christ says, "I am the Way . . . no one cometh unto the Father but by Me."

I do not believe that by these latter words he is denying that there is any real religion or union with God in human history outside of the circle of His own conscious personal disciples. The attempt to make the Fourth Gospel a Gnostic writing breaks down the moment we take its whole teaching of Christ as the Logos which "lighteneth every man" into full view. What He is thinking of is that He Himself is permanently essential to a life of communion with the Father as He has revealed Him. But that He certainly does hold. He is asserting that however far advanced the disciple may become in the knowledge and love of the Father, He Himself will never be outworn or outgrown, and He is asserting not only His own eternal necessity as the living way to the Father, but His own universal necessity as well. This is what makes Christianity essentially a missionary religion, and dooms to futility all merely eclectic views of the final faith. He is not a way among other ways to the universal Father, but The Way.

The story of the religions shows that there are two great Ways of establishing communion with God in nearly all of them, the Way of Sacrifice, and the Way of Law. The Way of Sacrifice is an attempt to bridge the gulf between man and God by cultus. Through offerings and through expiatory rites man endeavours to transcend the barrier to communion with God set up by human weakness and ignorance and sin. This barrier exists in all religions, especially in all which have reached an ethical conception of God. The moment men identify God with the moral ideal, in that moment there arises trouble in the conscience at the thought of Him. The purer the ideal, the more poignantly is the difficulty felt by the worshipper. Thus the great new difficulty to communion with God which has been created by Christ

is the height of the moral standard which He has set up. His life convicts the human race.

In the faith which has the highest spiritual ideal, and therefore the keenest sense of sin the opposition is overcome by the Incarnation and Cross of Christ. Here the Way to God and Life is not opened by man but by God Himself. It is vital to Christianity that the initiative is taken and maintained throughout by God. What this means for communion with Him and for the life which comes through that communion can best be brought out by an illustration.

I know a great man by reputation let us say, and I earnestly desire to turn that knowledge into a friendship. If I am very brazen and very persistent, I may get past his menials, and even if he is patient secure an interview. But an interview is not a friendship, and the more capable I am of friendship the more shall I feel constrained in his presence, for all the time I shall be actuely aware that the interview is of my seeking and not his, and that therefore I am in a false position. Friendship is impossible on these terms. But it is altogether another story when he comes seeking me, and persists in seeking me, and although rebuffed and wounded maintains the initiative which he began. The whole basis is radically altered, and when I come to my senses true friendship of the noblest kind is possible. So in the Christian view is it with God and man. No matter how dark man's conscience may be, the initiative has been taken by God. This is the basis of everything. Man's sin, ignorance, and weakness are all real, but we have to do with a God of grace. For the very purpose of sweeping away all these hindrances he has entered into human life and history in Christ, whose whole life and death and resurrection and gift of the Holy Spirit are, according to the Christian view, a manifestation and an effectuating of this initiative or grace of God. His death is its most poignant manifestation, but its power lies in its revela-

tion not of something spasmodic or abnormal, but of the unchanging heart of God to all men. It is at once the crowning manifestation of human sin and of divine grace, and the marvel of it is that each reveals the other, sin's true nature being disclosed there in the light of God's love, and God's love in the light of man's sin. There is here a far deeper manifestation both of the real character of God and of the nature of sin than could be given by any world assize, which at the best would not reveal much in the divine nature that the Cross reveals. Recognizing this the Christian Church has always looked on the Cross as something which sweeps away judgment and the fear of judgment from the Christian heart as something antiquated and done away for believing men.

> "O Love of God, O sin of Man,
> In this dread act your strength is tried,
> And victory remains with Love.
> Jesus our Lord is crucified."

The opening of the new and living Way by God is completed by the Resurrection, and the supreme Gift of Life through the Spirit. These are all elements in the great initiative of God. It results in the founding of the Church which is the effectuation of the Divine Grace in history, and its embodiment in a new society whose purpose is to go throughout all the world and throughout all generations, proclaiming the grace of God and His purpose for the salvation of men.

The entire expiatory and sacrificial side of world religion, the need for something to be done by the worshipper to propitiate God, is thus met by this radical conception of the grace of God which opens "a new and living Way to the Holiest of all."

But, as we have seen, there are among the world religions those also which turn on the idea that the true bond between God and man is found not in Sacrifice but in Law. Islam, which in all probability has its deepest historical root in Judaism, is the most conspicuous

example of this among the existing religions of mankind. The idea here is that God has given to men a Law, and that obedience to that Law is the Way of Life.

Now, in so far as the conception of merit on the part of him who keeps the Law comes in, pure Christianity has nothing to say to this view, for anything which disturbs its fundamental idea of the Grace of God is alien to its genius. Salvation is always of God's grace alone. This simple mighty truth is the very soul of the Gospel. But there is none the less a true need of man behind the craving for a law of God which finds expression in the religions of the law. Men knew that there must be only one Divine Will for them amid the multitude of options before them in their daily lives, and an Ideal Divine Order also above all the warring life of the nations. They know, too, that if the soul loses touch with that Will, or if the nations forsake that order, then they get out of touch with the Lord and Giver of that Life which they seek. If the child leaves the path which the Father has marked out for him, then it inevitably follows that true communion with Him has by that apostasy been made impossible. But how shall man know what that Divine Will, that spiritual order, demands of him. He needs a Law other than his own caprice. This is the source of the power of the religions of the Law. No religion can dispense with it, not even the religion of Grace. In it the unconditional grace of God must always come first, and always be the fundamental and sustaining element. But if that Grace is to realize itself in the life of man, it must express itself in a Law and an Order. Legalism inverts this and tends always to put law at the foundation and bring grace in to meet the difficulties that inevitably arise as the result of this inversion. This as we have seen is a radical departure from Revelation. But once the Christian man has got his footing on this rock of God's Grace to him in Christ, he needs and demands a law.

"Me this unchartered freedom tires;
I feel the weight of chance desires:
My hopes no more must change their name,
I long for a repose that ever is the same."

This need might conceivably have been met by Christ by the promulgation of a new code of laws bringing the Mosaic law as it were up to date. Some have regarded the Sermon on the Mount in this fashion. But the thing is impossible. There is no endeavour made in the Sermon to cover the whole of human life, or to deal in detail with questions of political morality, or social order. It is, however, couched in the form of paradox and illustration, not in the language of legislation, which ought always to be unambiguous and unadorned. Its very form should warn us against the idea that Jesus is repeating the error of the Jews in this matter. That error could only have resulted once more in the rise of a new Pharisaism, the expansion of the code into other and more widely ramified codes, and the creation within the new Religion of Scribes and Pharisees to interpret and apply the new Law.

Instead of all this Christ tells us that He Himself is the Way. Instead of giving us a new code God has given us a living Personal Leader and Guide. Once abandon the idea of a code and this is the only possible alternative. The disciple has not got to think of what the code says, which would inevitably lead to his asking what this or that Christian Rabbi says that the code means, and to the accumulation of mountains of precedents becoming ever vaster as Christian history drags its slow length along. The disciple has to acquire from the Gospel a true and vital understanding of the mind of Christ and to live in communion with the living Master. The promise is made him that if he will do this "the Spirit will be given him." He will acquire an instinct for the will of the Lord which will guide him through any labyrinth out to the clear day of Truth. Briefly summed up

the teaching of the Gospel is, "Follow Christ, and leave all the rest to Almighty God. You are in a labyrinth, it is true, but you are not alone. He is with you, and your sole duty is to keep in touch with Him." Oliver Cromwell is reported to have said, "A man never rises so high as when he does not know where he is going." He meant, I suppose, that when a man has given himself wholly to Truth and Duty, he has not the faintest idea where in the world of time they will take him. He only knows that he is going home. He is at the absolute disposal of the Almighty. So, since it is the essential Christian principle that Jesus Christ is the Truth, it inevitably follows that He is the Way.

The Apostolic writings bear witness to the immense expansion of life and freedom and joy, which came to those who pursued this Way of fellowship and dedication. "The Law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," said St. Paul, "hath made me free from the Law of Sin and Death."

But in saying this, we have already passed over to the third of the three great principles of the Christian Gospel, "I am the Life."

All religions seek to bestow upon man the Supreme Good, and, broadly regarded, that Good, as we have seen, is summed up in the word "Life." Religion, as we have seen, is a prayer for life. Nor is it by any accident that the leading practical aim of the Christian revelation is eternal life, that the consummation of the whole process of redemption is the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, and that the supreme fact of the Christian history which plainly created the new life and thought of the Church and indeed created the Church itself, was the Resurrection. It is profoundly impressive to trace in many religions the human yearning after life, and then to turn to the great Book of Life, and to hear all these chords taken up in its vaster music. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the

law of sin and of death." "In Him was life and the life was the light of men." "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "And this is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent." Such sayings as these might be multiplied indefinitely, both from the Old and New Testament, just as one could go through the classics of the great religions and all their rites and ceremonies and trace in them all this one determining aim.

It is life as viewed from within that is always meant in the Bible. The Hebrew knows no such sharp distinction as does the modern between physical and spiritual life. He views it as a whole, he thinks of life as we experience it, and if pressed would no doubt have said that bodily life was one of its manifestations, and mental life another. Life for him is "the total phenomenon,"[4] and it is all inspired by the Breath of God. As the revelation deepens and widens, more and more emphasis is laid upon the spiritual side of life, and the ultimate conception, as we find it in the New Testament, is of Life that breaks clear at last from every fetter of mortality, and finds itself perfected in the eternal world. But Biblical thought knows nothing anywhere of disembodied life. The body is part of man's personality, and must persist with him if he is to persist at all. But it becomes transfigured and "made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light." The Greek idea of the body as the prison of the soul from which it escapes at death, is not the complete Biblical idea, and therefore the prevailing teaching of the Bible looks forward not to annihilation of the seen and temporal order, of which the body is part, but to its transformation into the spiritual, "to a new heaven and earth in which dwelleth righteousness."

I have thus endeavoured to show in broad outline the new context in which the developing science of relig-

[4]See A. B. Davidson's *Old Testament Theology.*

ion is enabling us to place the unchanging truths of the Christian revelation. I believe that in future it will be possible to establish this relationship in much fuller detail, and that new light will be thrown from all quarters of the horizon on the central truths of Revelation. Meantime it is open to any one to verify the matter for himself. If he thinks that I am constructing an argument instead of reporting on the facts as I have found them, let him take any of the existing text books on the Science of Religion and see whether they do or do not expound the three elements of which I have spoken; then let him for example take the psalter or any one of our modern Christian hymn books and opening it at random take almost any hymn that he chooses and see whether it does not contain one or more of these elements invariably, and most often all of them. A few experiments will be enough to convince him of the essential unity, in form at least, of all religions, the Christian included.

But it may be said, If this be so, does not the Christian religion simply become one among the rest, the noblest of them all it may be granted, but still only the highest of a series, as its Founder is only one who has climbed further up the mount of vision than other men. If it be so, then it must needs be in view of the story of the past that He, too, will be in time transcended and that Christianity like all the other religions will be broken up by the life of that Spirit which has called it into being. This, above all others, is the main danger threatened by the new knowledge, as it is the crucial question of Christian thought to-day. On its answer depends not only the future of the Christian religion but its present demand upon men. For if Jesus Christ may at some time in the future be superseded by someone to whom God may grant a more intimate revelation of Himself, then there is no reason why He should not be superseded to-morrow or to-day. I may go, for in-

stance, from the room in which I am sitting out into some spiritualistic *séance*, or meet with some prophet from the Himalayas who convinces me that at certain points the Christian revelation is at fault, that it was true for its own time, true also for all the centuries that have intervened since it came into the world at the first, the truest that at the time the world could apprehend, but that now we have got deeper into the great mystery of Being. Suppose I accept this new revelation. What inevitably follows is that Jesus Christ passes from His place as Saviour and Lord into the lower rank of Friend and Helper of the soul. I am at once committed not to a Christian view of the world but to an eclectic view, containing many Christian elements it may be, but inevitably centred round the new revelation which for me has now become that *ens realissimum*, which I formerly believed to be the personality of Christ. It is clear that in making this transition, I pass into a radically different spiritual world. Or again, suppose that I am a missionary in India, and in my endeavours to state the Christian Gospel in terms of thought which my Indian friends can understand, I get caught up in the vortex of Vedantic or modern Theosophic speculation. I find that the simplest way out of my difficulty is to assume that Christ was only one of many *Avatars* of the Supreme Being. The inevitable consequence will be that all the propagandist power will go out of my religion. Or again, let us suppose that in my thinking about the application of the Christian morality to the relations between nations, I come to the conclusion that it is impossible to bring such high and intricate matters as international politics within the sphere of Christian duty. By so doing, I admit that Christ is the rightful Lord of only a part of human life, that in that other sphere there is some other law which I must obey. I am once more in effect saying that the Christian religion is not final, that the Christian ideal is not absolute, which just means

that the Christian revelation of the nature of God is not wholly true. It is clear that here again I have passed from historical Christianity to something radically different. Yet, once more let us suppose that, impressed by the stupendous magnitude and the formidable shadows of the great world of Nature, I come to the teaching of Jesus about the Fatherhood of God and the duty of simple, unbounded, childlike faith in Him Who numbers the hairs of our heads, and counts the very breaths that His children draw, and say, "it is beautiful but it is not wholly true: there is a truth in it, but it is not the whole truth, nor is it possible to-day any longer to base one's life upon it and take all the risks of that daring experiment." Again, by thus departing from the absoluteness and finality of Christ, and striking an average between Nature and Christ as authorities I depart radically from the Christian view of things, and go over to another which has far-reaching consequences for conduct and the whole inward life and the relation of man to the Supreme. At all points these questions are coming up again to-day as living questions. I believe that when they are reduced to their elements, they are in effect the same as the Church had to face in its first three centuries, which it settled in terms of the thought of its time in the Nicene creed.

Is the Christian religion only one among the other religions, or is it the religion towards which the others are groping? Is it the final religion beyond which none can ever pass? Is the revelation of God which we have in Jesus Christ absolute or is it only relative? These are the questions which the Science of Religion as well as the pressure of our new knowledge of nature and the development of the life of the nations is forcing upon us to-day.

What means have we for giving a definite answer to questions such as these? It may fairly be asked, how can you possibly prove that the revelation of God in

Jesus Christ is of the final and absolute character which you assert of it? Humanity is a wide word, and by what right can you go to every man and say to him that this Jesus is the one way to the Father for him? None but a fraction of mankind has ever believed in Him. By what right, when you think of the infinite variety of human nature, can you assert that he stands to every man alike an embodied conscience in history claiming his entire belief and devotion, and by what right do you send missionaries to India and to China, demanding from those immemorial civilizations that they abandon that which lies at the roots of every thing else, and receive instead the revelation in Christ? Still more when we think of the immense course of human history, when we realize that that history may be as yet only in the hours of its dawn, by what right can you say that Christ can never be outgrown? that He is the final revelation and the final authority? Why should not the humanity out of which He came produce some other and greater than the Galilean, some one who shall more intimately disclose the answer to those searching questions which are not to be evaded but honestly faced and answered. Personally, in examining my own thoughts on the matter afresh, I would say, firstly, that the root of my own conviction as to the finality of the Christian religion lies in this, that Jesus seems to me quite plainly, consciously, and persistently, to have declared this finality: and that He has inspired in my own spirit such confidence and reverence in Himself that I believe in Him. I would add, secondly, that my own experience, as He said it would, is continually verifying that faith; that the Christian Church on a vastly wider scale has verified it and is verifying it; and that, therefore, He seems to me more than ever to be the sole solution of the great riddle of the world, and the one adequate answer to that great human prayer for life which the story of religion reveals.

Surely the history of religion so far as it has gone sub-

stantiates that view. What is the general story of the rise of a new religion in the earth? History has no more stirring and noble pages than those which tell of the rise of the great religious Founders. They appear in many places, in the deer park of Benares, the Desert of Arabia, and the tableland of Iran, and they proclaim the great new truth which they have learned in solitary communion with the unseen world. By a spiritual gravitation, the noblest youth of their time are drawn to them—

> "Learn their great accents, catch their clear watchwords,
> Make them their patterns to live or to die"

Then follows a great fight of the soul, the ever recurring strife between the light and the darkness. Every social prejudice, every entrenched wrong, every vested interest, is instinctively up in arms against any fundamental change in religion. "All things," said Emerson, "are at odds when God lets a new thinker loose upon this planet." This is pre-eminently true of religious change of the very basis of society changed in the form of religion. There is a hard and bitter struggle, but the forces of the spirit of God fight for the new truth and at last it triumphs. Time passes and then within what was once a new religion but which is now growing old, there appear new forces of reform, carrying out it may be the spirit if not the letter of the intentions of the original Founder. The old fight is at once renewed. But this time the name of the Founder is used as the banner of reaction. He who was once the Liberator has now become the tyrant and gaoler of the Spirit. The rapiers are changed. Laertes wounds Hamlet and Hamlet Laertes. If the forces of reform which are the forces of the Spirit triumph, the religion goes forward, but it goes forward by outgrowing its Founder. That is true of all other religions but it is not true of the absolute religion. So far as Christian history has gone it shows that the Christian religion is renewed by returning to its Founder.

The forces of the Spirit which break up other religions reveal new treasures in the Christian revelation which had before been concealed.[5] So at the Reformation, it was the return to the Pauline understanding of Christ and His salvation that renewed the waning energies of the Christian Church and set the modern world on the lines of Freedom. So in our day again, it has been, I believe, the return to the human Christ above all that has kept the Church from petrifaction. I do not know any modern treatise of Christian apologetic which does not make the Personality of Christ its central article, and surely there is a profound significance in this fact. Is not this what we should expect from our Lord's own words about the Spirit, "He shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you."

Does it not vindicate these words, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me."

But while this finality is true of the gift of God in Him, it is only partly true of the many forms which the Christian religion has taken in the long course of its history. The forces of the spirit which are ever working in all religions, moulding and reshaping and developing them, are at work also within the Christian Church itself. Here I find continual evolution, and no theory attaining to finality.

But it is different with that which lies behind all the power of Christian polity and Christian thought, the unchanging gift of God in Jesus Christ. The forces of the Spirit as a mere matter of history have not disintegrated the life and work of the Founder. It can, on the contrary, be shown that instead of disintegrating these, these forces renew the life of the Church by calling it back ever and again to things undiscovered before in Him. From such discoveries there come all the great historic renewals of the Christian life. There is no real

[5] I am indebted for this thought to my friend and colleague, Principal Iverach.

parallel to this in history. That history as we know it, illustrates not only the saying "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," but these words as well, "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me."

St. Paul on Preaching.

By Robert Law, D.D.
Professor Knox College, Toronto.

Some person of note—Chrysostom, if I remember rightly—is reported to have said that, if wishes could translate one into the past, his first wish would have been to see Our Lord in the flesh, his second to hear the Apostle Paul preach; and we always think of St. Paul as the great preacher no less than as the great missionary and theologian of the Apostolic Age. Although the estimate of his oratorical powers expressed by certain of his contemporaries was the reverse of flattering, and though he himself betrays the consciousness that in brilliancy and polish he fell short of some whom partisanship insisted on thrusting forward as his rivals, it is beyond question that among the many superb gifts he possessed that of speech was not the least. High Roman officials, Jewish princes, audiences of diverse nationality and diverse character, the peasants of Lystra, the *dilettanti* of Athens, the mixed multitude of Corinth, the worshippers in many a synagogue, the mob at Jerusalem, all acknowledged its power. It was the chief instrument of his wonderful propagation of the Gospel; his missionary methods inevitably made it so.

The three sermons of which an outline has been preserved in the Acts of the Apostles, that spoken at Pisidian Antioch and addressed to a typical congregation of Hellenistic Jews and "God-fearers," and those addressed to pagan assemblies at Lystra and Athens, are valuable, apart from their contents, as illustrating St. Paul's

method of approaching a non-Christian audience and introducing his message to it. In each case he begins from what is common ground to himself and his hearers; with the Jews, from their national history and Messianic hope, with the peasants of Asia Minor from a few simple truths of natural religion, with the Athenians from the yearning after an "Unknown God" with which he credits them. In each case he labours to present Christ and the Christian faith as the perfect fulfilment of truths already dimly seen and aspirations vaguely cherished. These sermons finely illustrate his maxim of making himself all things to all men, and also the deep, unaffected sympathy which enabled him to act upon it.

It is in his Epistles, however, and especially in those to the Corinthians, that St. Paul expresses himself fully on the matter, method and spirit of Gospel-preaching; and in this article I shall draw chiefly upon those passages in First Corinthians which relate to this subject. In that Epistle the references to preaching are all dominated by one purpose, that of rightly relating the human to the Divine element in it. Preaching is the work of man; but preaching that is of any avail must be also the work of God. We are fellow-labourers with God. The whole of the opening section of the Epistle is influenced by this same necessity. St. Paul instinctively apprehends that the source of the party-spirit which was rending the Corinthian Church into rival factions lay, as it always does lie, in an over-estimation of the human element and an under-estimation of the Divine element in the life of the Church. He sets himself, therefore, to exhibit in every possible light the great fact that the redemptive power in Christianity is wholly of God, not of man. He finds this truth in the characteristics of the Gospel-message itself (I 17–25); in the characteristics of the Christian Community (I 26–31); in those of the Gospel-ministry as illustrated in himself (II 1–5); in the fact that the Gospel is a Divine revelation through the Spirit (II 6–III 4).

Finally this principle determines the true place and function of human teachers in the Church. They are instruments, and only instruments, of God (III 5–9); and what is taught by them, to be of enduring value, must be based upon the One Divine Foundation of truth and life, which is Christ Jesus (III 10–15). Such is the ruling idea which runs through this important section of the Epistle, and, though less distinctly, through the whole. Let us see how it bears upon St. Paul's conception of the preacher and his office.

First, it determines that the preacher must be divinely called and sent. "Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel" (I 17). It is illegitimate to read into these often-quoted words any disparagement of the sacramental element in the Christian religion. It does not appear that St. Paul's practice of delegating to his assistants the work of preparing converts for baptism and administering the rite differed from that of other apostles (Acts X 48); but in the special circumstances of the case, he felt thankful that he had baptized so few of the Corinthians with his own hands, and so had forestalled the insinuation, of which some were capable, that he had sought in this way to secure a special attachment of the converts to his own person. The point of importance, however, is the Apostle's recognition that the work to which he was designated and sent was distinctively that of a preacher, a herald of the Kingdom. To make converts, not to baptize them, was the mission to which he was called, and which evoked all his enthusiasm and absorbed all his energies. To others belonged the catechetical and administrative functions. Another passage (IX 16–18) expresses still more strongly St. Paul's feeling on this point. Explaining why he does not avail himself of his right to "live of the Gospel" (a right which he no less emphatically asserts than he resolutely declines to use it), he says: "For though I preach the Gospel I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me;

for woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel." In the words that follow he goes so far as to disclaim volition in the matter. "For, if I do this willingly (spontaneously, on my own initiative) I have (have a right to take) a wage; but if unwillingly (because necessity is laid upon me), it is a stewardship of the Gospel that is entrusted to me. What then is my wage? That when I preach the Gospel I may make the Gospel without charge". The passage is emotional and scarcely bears logical analysis. Every good and noble course of action that is within one's power is a bounden Christian duty; and the preacher who accepts a salary in order to give himself undividedly to the work does so for a reason no less Christian than St. Paul's for refusing maintenance. But these verses open a window into the Apostle's soul, revealing how he conceived his mission, how it took hold both of his conscience and his emotions. In preaching the Gospel he was merely discharging an obligation which there was no evading, doing that which he was debtor to all men to do; but he saw a higher ideal within his reach, a greater sacrifice, and from this sacrifice he derived a joy which he refused to be deprived of. *His sacrifices were his luxuries.* His *misthos*, his wage, was to preach the Gospel without wage. We have here the strongest expression of the preacher's consciousness of a Divine imperative. "Necessity is laid upon me; woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel." This necessity, this sense of a Divine vocation, the true preacher must always more or less vividly feel. The word of God is as a fire in his bones.

Further, the principle of the right relation of the human to the divine determines for St. Paul the *style* of preaching. "And I, brethren, when I came among you, came announcing to you the testimony of God, not as a master of speech or wisdom" (II 1). The Apostle's aim was not to shine as a philosopher or rhetorician. He sought to fashion his presentation according to his theme; and that theme, the testimony of God, demanded straightforward state-

ment rather than philosophical disquisition or oratorical display. Possibly St. Paul was conscious that he could have orated and debated with the best of the sophists and rhetors; but if he possessed the power, he deliberately refrained from using it. "For Christ sent me . . . to preach the Gospel, not in wisdom of speech (not in the style of dialectic, not clothing the Gospel in the garb of a philosophy), lest the Cross of Christ should be emptied of its significance". The rule which St. Paul here implies is that which governs all interpretative art. The presentation ought to be entirely subordinated to the object presented, should aim at the clearest, most intelligible and vivid setting forth of that object, at that and at nothing else, avoiding everything that is calculated to divert attention and interest from the object to the manner of the presentation or to the person who makes it. In short, it ought to be that kind of medium through which the object may best make its own impression. Thus in writing, any style that presents the subject-matter (if of a serious sort, and not matter merely for embroidery or filigree-work) lucidly and vividly, and therefore interestingly to the reader who is capable of interest, is good style; any style which obtrudes itself and subtracts from the reader's interest in the subject-matter is bad style. And preaching is an interpretative art. Gospel-preaching is essentially the presentation of an object—Christ, who of God is made to us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption. Its power lies not in the human presentation, but in the object presented; and whatever turns attention and interest from the Divine object to the manner of the preaching or the person of the preacher, or to any other extraneous matter, is alien to the proper character and aim of the preacher's art. Any sermon which sends the hearers away with a fresh vision of Christ and a fresh resolve to obey the vision, is, St. Paul would say, a good sermon; any sermon the chief impression left by which is

the eloquence, brilliancy, wit, or eccentricity of the preacher is a bad sermon. Such preaching is bad art, to say nothing more. It defeats its own end.

It was said of the two greatest orators of antiquity, Demosthenes and Cicero, that after listening to the Philippics of Cicero men said, What a magnificent oration! After hearing the Athenian orator they said, Let us go and fight Philip. The effect corresponded to the character of the speakers. Demosthenes was single-minded, on fire with the passion for liberty and hatred of its assailants. Cicero, at his best, could never rise above self-consciousness, retained always something of the *poseur*. St. Paul was of the Demosthenic order. He was the most self-adaptive of preachers; made himself all things to all men, if by any means he might save some. But by that condition his self-adaptiveness was limited. He refused to adapt himself to the Corinthian taste for showy rhetoric and pretentious dialectic. By doing so he could perhaps have gained a high reputation, and even secured an immediately wider interest in his message. But it would have been a meretricious interest, an interest not in the Cross of Christ, but in a new rhetorician or a new philosophy; and from such a mode of approach he resolutely turned aside. All this has its parallel to-day. It is demanded of the preacher that at all costs he be vivacious, interesting, titillating the sensibilities, even if he do not deeply grip the conscience or illumine the mind. But there is a price which, even for this, the true preacher will refuse to pay.

On what, then, did St. Paul rely, if not on wisdom of words? "And my speech and proclamation of my message were not in persuasive words of wisdom but in demonstration of Spirit and power, that your faith might not stand in wisdom of men but in the power of God" (II 4, 5). "Demonstration" (*apodeixis*) was a technical term of Greek rhetoric for syllogistic proof from given premises; and St. Paul means to say that he had eschewed the

whole apparatus of technical *apodeixis* and substituted for it a different way of demonstrating the truth he had to communicate, that which consists in spirit and power. But what does this mean? By many expositors, ancient and modern, the reference is understood to be to the miracles and other external manifestations by which the Spirit attested the Apostle's preaching. And in view of II Cor. XII 12—"The signs of an apostle were wrought among you with all perseverance, both signs and wonders and works of power"—this cannot be excluded from the "demonstration" of spirit and power. Yet it is difficult to suppose that this is the whole or even the primary reference. Such "signs" were no doubt regarded as an indispensable attestation of apostleship; but that is one thing, and to say that St. Paul relied mainly on these as the means of demonstrating the truth of his Gospel and winning for it the response of a living faith, is to say a quite different thing. Had he done so he would have been false to his own principles. Wherein would he have differed, or have expected and encouraged others to differ, from the Jews who "seek a sign"? As he goes on to show in this same chapter, Christian faith depends not on outward signs or logical argumentation, but on the witness of the Spirit of God in the spirit of man. Here "spirit and power" stand in contrast to "wisdom" (as the Corinthians understood it). St. Paul does not seek to compel his hearers by skilful dialectic. The power which shot the "winged words" of his preaching into the very soul and conscience of his hearers was not rhetorical or philosophical but spiritual. And I take it that he is here thinking of this power as operative in and through his own personality. The Apostle was filled with such spiritual power; and, as he spoke, the power of the truth, firing his own soul, leaped out on his hearers and fired their souls also. It was this on which, from his own side of the matter, he depended for the preacher's true success, the awakening of faith. Faith which depends on a

clever argument can be upset by a more clever argument. It is only by "spirit and power" that a living faith can be communicated from soul to soul. The preacher must have his own mind and spirit so charged with the spiritual power of his message that his enthusiastic conviction of its truth and sense of its urgency shall be transmitted to others. Like every high and precious thing, spiritual force in preaching has its cheap counterfeits; and what is only temperamental vehemence or the self-engendered warmth of oratory, the heat of the pulpit, may pass with preacher and hearers alike for "spirit and power." But to obtain this in its reality demands not only Divine donation but mental and spiritual toil. One must dwell with one's theme, steep one's soul in it, become saturated with it, and, first and last of all, live it—only so can one hope to proclaim it with what St. Paul calls "demonstration of spirit and power."

But, further, he emphasizes the truth that the preacher is dependent for the achievement of his aim upon the activity of the Spirit not only in himself but in those to whom his message is delivered. "I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase" (III 6, 7). It is not meant that in an absolute sense the human agent is nothing (that it is of no moment who plants and who waters, or how they do it), but that in comparison with the Divine agency the human is relatively nothing, and without the Divine agency would be absolutely so. All man can do in agriculture, or in any form of human effort, is to bring some cosmic force into operation, to open a sluice through which the Divine energies flow. So it is in preaching; and to remember this guarantees the preacher's humility. "Who then is Paul or who is Apollos but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every one?" (III 5). In every case the efficient cause of the "believing" is not the work of Paul or Apollos

but is the Lord's. Yet this truth does not paralyse, it stimulates the preacher's effort. He plants and sows with confidence because it is God who gives the increase. "Ye are God's field; ye are God's building" (III 9). Our work, St. Paul would say, is fruitful, our reward assured, just because you on whom our labour is spent are God's field, not our own. Because ye are God's building, we builders build not in vain.

Nay, more, this was the Apostle's centre of strength as a preacher, his assurance of victory against the blindness, prejudice and hostility of the world. No preacher, perhaps, has felt more acutely than St. Paul the moral difficulty of preaching the Gospel, the demand it makes upon moral courage. He everywhere reveals the fact that his was an unusually sensitive nature, deeply affected by the feelings and judgments of his fellowmen. His power of sympathetic insight creates an inevitable responsiveness to everything in his environment that is hostile to his Gospel and to himself as its messenger. The very emphasis with which he protests and reiterates that he is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ reveals how strongly he reacts against the temptations to be ashamed of it. He is always challenging the world because he feels how the world is always challenging him, driving him back upon his centre, the faith guaranteed to him in his own experience. He is well aware, and feels profoundly, that to the great multitude of men and the conceptions by which they are governed, his Gospel of salvation through the Crucified is not only unattractive and even repellent, but meaningless and absurd. So be it, he says. He recognizes the fact in all its force, and braces himself to meet it. So be it. Let this Gospel be foolishness to men; nevertheless it has pleased God by the foolishness of this preaching to save them that believe. If this is foolishness it is a Divine foolishness (St. Paul never shrinks from the language of paradox), and the foolishness of God is wiser than men, as the weakness of God is stronger than men.

All this is truth for to-day. The preacher needs, the whole church needs, a deeper conviction and realization of it. Our danger is a superficial and one-sided practicality, a trust in the power of efficient apparatus. We can no longer say of the Church that not many wise, not many well-born, not many influential persons belong to it. Its resources in men and money, in learning and eloquence, in zeal and devotion, are no longer despicable. For any other purpose than the spiritual regeneration of men and society they would constitute a formidable power. But for this, for the regeneration of a single soul, they of themselves avail no more than would a trumpet-blast to bring down the walls of Jericho. Why do we preach? Why do we and why ought we to go on doing it? What do we expect from it, and what is the ground of our expectation? One thing alone can justify it to rational men. Faith in the living God, in the promise and working of the Spirit, along with and through yet above and beyond all human effort, to make our message His power unto unto salvation. It is this that makes the preaching of the Gospel a calling to be engaged in by men who seriously wish to make the most and best of their lives.

Lastly we come to St. Paul's definition of the preacher's theme. His aim is to "persuade men" (II Cor. V 11) to incite and draw men over to a course of action. Conscience must be awakened—the conscience is the preacher's throne. Emotion must be kindled, for men will do with a warm heart what they could not do, or could not do so well, with a cold heart; emotion is the tide that lifts the ship across the bar. And the springs of moral and emotional force are accessible to our human ministry chiefly through the intelligence. It is by ideas that conscience is enlightened and quickened, and emotions stirred. Ideas are the seed of life, and spiritual ideas are the seed of spiritual life. They become the power of the Holy Spirit by which hearts are changed and conduct is directed. And St. Paul found in one single fact, and nowhere else,

the source of all such ideas, of those truths which are the power of God unto salvation. "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified" (I Cor. II 2). Others might present Jesus Christ in other aspects; but St. Paul's Gospel had its one and perennial source in the Cross. The Cross was not an incident of history, but a fact eternal in its significance and power. There was no redemption for sinful men except through Christ crucified, risen and enthroned; and there was no other Gospel than that in Him God was reconciling the world unto Himself. The Jew required a sign—a man who would work a miracle, display a prodigy; the Greek sought after wisdom—a man who would argue and dissertate and perorate. No, says St. Paul, we come with the news of a Person who has lived and for ever lives, and of a fact about Him, that He died for our sins and rose again and that we have redemption through His blood. Stripped as far as possible of all human additions and accretions he would make known this Person on whom, and this supreme fact about Him on which, our salvation depends. This is St. Paul's ideal of missionary or evangelistic preaching, to set this Christ forth and, as it were, placard Him before men in the most concrete and straightforward manner; not theorizing, but statement, not preaching *about* the Gospel but preaching the Gospel.

But the Apostle does not regard this as the only kind of preaching. For the full development of Christian thought, character and conduct, the fact of Christ must be interpreted; must be related to all the great facts of existence, to God and the moral order and the providential government of the universe, to the facts of human history and experience, to the great changeless problems of the individual soul and the social order, to the particular problems of the time and place. And this St. Paul himself does, and does beyond any other man. He declares that he will not philosophize, but though he has no interest in speculation as such, his is the first and greatest of contributions to

Christian philosophy. No one else has done so much to unfold the theological, ethical, social, cosmic significance of Christ crucified. And he expressly recognizes that in Christian preaching and teaching there is superstructure as well as foundation. "According to the grace (of apostleship) given unto me, as a wise master-builder I have laid the foundation and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon; for other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (III 10, 11.) The Apostle had striven to base the faith and life of his converts upon this foundation, with no intrusion of extraneous matter between their souls and the personal Christ. Of that he is sure. His concern is as to the superstructure which those who are continuing his work may raise upon it. Then follows the brilliant allegory (III 12–15) of the two workmen who build so diversely upon the same foundation. The one uses only the finest and most durable materials, costly stones for the masonry, gold and silver for decoration. He is building with a view to permanence, temple or palace which shall resist the inroads of decay for many generations. The other rears a crazy structure, with walls of cheap boarding, roof of straw or reeds, the interstices filled in with promiscuous rubbish. One day fire sweeps over the city, consuming all that fire can kindle upon. The first edifice is practically fireproof. Its massive walls and pillars stand erect among the surrounding ruins. The flimsy hovel goes up in a flare; of its wretched materials nothing remains but the ashes.

Such is the picture the Apostle puts before us of the different kinds of work which spiritual builders may do, and of the subsequent result; these builders being, as the context shows, religious teachers, and the materials with which they build the substance of their teaching. Some of them St. Paul represents as raising a substantial and beautiful edifice, worthy of the foundation. They teach faithfully the truths by which men

live rightly in the present age and are fitted for that to come. They raise upon the One Foundation a superstructure of Christian doctrine and Christian ethics—a Christian view of the world, and a Christian law of life, which rests in every part upon that Foundation and is in keeping with it, and is comparable to gold, silver and costly stones, of inestimable and indestructible worth. But there are others who, the Apostle fears, are heaping up mere rubbish. Whether they seek to delight their hearers with sophistical subtlety or windy rhetoric, occupy their minds with talk about trivial temporary things, or offer them instead of the fine wheat of God's Word the innutritious stubble of speculation or the chaff of mere verbiage, the result is the same. "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed." The slumbering conscience is not awakened; the awakened conscience is not guided and instructed; the people of God are not furnished unto every good work.

Now the permanent worth or worthlessness of the work may not presently appear; the spiritual jerry-builder may make rapid progress. But, says the Apostle, the Day will declare it. The fire of God's judgment will try every man's work of what sort it is. All that is genuine metal will pass through these last fires unscathed; the costly stones, the solid masonry, the columns of jasper and marble, will remain intact. But of the wood, hay, stubble nothing will be seen but a charred and unsightly ruin. Thus with the buildings. What of the builders? "If any man's work shall abide, he shall receive a reward." He shall hear the Master's "Well done." "But if his work shall be burned, he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Like the man who stands stripped of all his labours, amid the smoking ruins of his home, and is himself barely dragged into safety through the flames, so shall the unskilful and careless Gospel-builder at last appear. I do not discuss here the eschatological presuppositions of the passage. Its import is

plain, and no man to whom the ministry of the Gospel is entrusted can realize what that is without solemn awe. He stands here in the place of highest opportunity, his work therefore stands exposed to the most searching judgment. It is as knowing the fear of the Lord that we ought to persuade men.

And the more particular teaching of the allegory is universally applicable. Preaching need not be, and ought not to be, entirely foundation-laying; but it must all be specifically Christian, teaching that is built upon Christ and Him crucified. Take the doctrine of Theism for example. Never more than today has the world needed a strong fundamental Theism as the only basis that can sustain the burden of thinking men. Can we offer that message? Are we able to proclaim with unfaltering soul a God who is really God, not a half-grown God, one struggling to become God, but a God who has created and upholds all things and takes responsibility for all his works, whose presence, thought and power permeate all existence, whose unfailing purpose disposes all events, overrules all wills, shapes all destinies? On one foundation only can we build such a conviction. How can life today be interpreted theistically except by the Cross? How can any one believe in a real and reigning God except by Jesus Christ, except as the God who sits above the water floods yet is partaker in all our human tragedy, afflicted in all our afflictions, wronged in all our wrongs, who is wounded by our sins and pays the price of blood for the world's redemption; and yet again is God, holding in His hand the helm of our little lives and the helm of the great universe, whose supremacy excludes all fear that ultimate victory can anywhere rest with evil and assures us that every purpose of love and righteousness shall reach its goal? Faith in such a God is possible only as we see and feel the divinity of Jesus as a living eternal truth. The doctrine of the Cross alone can bring back into human life the note of joy and triumph; and that it

may do this, the Spirit must search for us the deep things of God and we must teach them. The Incarnation and the Cross and the Resurrection and the Consummation must come to their own in our pulpits.

Then there is the field of ethics. It is demanded of us who are preachers that we preach ethically. And what, indeed, is preaching worth if it is not ethical, if it does not awaken and educate the conscience? We do not preach as ethically as we ought. The ethic of the pulpit is often sadly conventional and superficial. It is not such as to convict our hearers of sin, or to enlighten their ignorance. These are for the most part quite respectable people. They fulfil the requirements of customary morality. They are not for the most part guilty of the gross sins for which preachers of earlier times made the consciences of their hearers quake. It is easy but also futile to fulminate against vices which everybody reprobates. Does our ethical teaching keep in advance of the moral attainment of the age? Is it educative? Does it reveal unpossessed territory and untrodden heights; and make self-satisfaction impossible to the candid mind? There is a kind of ethical teaching, much in vogue in certain quarters, which is mainly negative, and is sufficiently indicated when it is called the ethic of the taboo. It makes not saints but Pharisees. The only ethic which is alway in advance of attainment, which, like the Star of Bethlehem, always goes before, is the Ethic of the Cross, the Ethic which has alike as its law and its dynamic the commandment, ever old and ever new, "Love one another even as I have loved you." The law written in the Blood of Calvary is the law that the preacher must write on his own heart, and then on the hearts of other men.

Again the preacher is called upon from all sides to preach a social Gospel, and he must do it. It is our own time and place with all their happenings, problems and perplexities in which we live and to which we must preach. But to preach a social Gospel is not to turn the pulpit

into a Sunday supplement to the daily newspaper. It is a far greater task. The preacher must labour to get for himself and impart to others the Christian view of society and its institutions, the Family, the State, Property, Work and Wages, of the spiritual laws on which these are based and the spiritual ends they are designed to fulfil. His business is not to solve political or economic problems, but to unfold the Law of Christ, so far as he can, in the breadth of its significance for the complex life of our time. And above all it is to beget and foster that spirit on whose guidance and power the solution of all our problems ultimately depends, the spirit of Him who came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many. Everywhere, as St. Paul would tell us, from whatever field of thought and effort we look, the Cross is the centre of light and power.

What changes in the methods and institutions of Christian service the future may bring we cannot foresee; but it is difficult to imagine that a time will ever come—it will not at any rate come soon—when preaching will not be what it has been since the Apostolic age, the chief means of propagating and interpreting the Christian faith, of quickening and educating conscience, kindling affection and fertilizing thought, of applying the Christian Revelation to the great unchangeable needs of human nature and to the ever-changing aspects of human life. It is safe also to prophesy that so long as Christian men preach the Christian Gospel they will find their ideals most satisfyingly and inspiringly set before them in the writings of St. Paul. And as in the light of these ideals their task is one before which they must be humbled with a sense of impotence, in the same measure will they be strengthened and impelled by sharing his conviction and experience, that their message is the wisdom and the power of God unto salvation, and that in delivering it they have with them, if they seek it and rely upon it, the Spirit that quickeneth, the Creative Breath of the Living God.

W. J. Birkbeck and Russian Orthodoxy

By Nicholas Glubokovsky, D.D.

(*To the bright memory of a dear friend*)

"Give rest, O Christ, to thy servant, with thy saints, where sorrow and pain are no more, neither sighing, but life everlasting."

The greatest war in the history of the world is now taking place, accompanied by cataclysms, even in countries where the accepted order seemed to be secured by many long years of popular acquiescence and by inherited authority, holy in its stability. In the midst of the anxiety of these potent times "when the fashion of this world passes away" (I Corinthians VII 31), we feel the need of some unshakable principle which shall impart firm stability and secure a mutual sense of peace and friendliness among men. The temporary invariably refers us to the eternal. And where are we to seek the latter honours if not in Christianity? For here is the ground where we can fruitfully seek the wished-for basis of universal harmony.

In this sense the workers for Christian brotherliness, who carry humanity on towards the goal of our being, are especially precious. Their achievements serving this great purpose shall forever remain a source of inspiration, telling of Christian solidarity, guaranteeing well-being on earth and promising eternal bliss in heaven. One of these bright personalities we beheld in William John Birkbeck, who laboured so abundantly, so fruitfully and so nobly for the union of Anglicanism and Russian Or-

thodoxy. It was our irreparable loss that he met an untimely death, at fifty-six, only a few days after his return to England from Russia, which he loved not less than his own country. He truly was one of the few men "who being dead yet speak" (Hebrews XI 4), appealing to us to imitate and continue his labours. Hence this brief account, in his memory, from a Russian point of view.

Mr. Birkbeck belonged to the old nobility of the land; a man of wealth, independent in his own country, with a many-sided education obtained in the best schools of England, at Eton and the University of Oxford. He first visited Russia in 1882, having gone for a trip in Scandinavian lands after his graduation. He arrived in Petrograd from Stockholm. At this time most fantastical rumours of a rather gloomy character concerning Russia obtained in England, and many in both countries were in open enmity. If there were Russians who fancied that at every step and forever the "English woman" interfered with them, England, on its own account, was profoundly of the opinion that the "Russian bear" wished to cross her at all points of the compass, attempting to raise his destructive paw against her Indian possessions, where (as was stated even by certain viceroys) cannon were placed in the crenellated towers in the expectation of a Russian invasion.

In that troublesome time the very trip of an Englishman to Russia was a moral achievement, for he was sure to meet much unpleasantness and was likely to take home with him nothing but bitterness as a result of direct contact with animosity and total ignorance in circles where people should have knowledge of religions and cults.

But the action of his soul was so free and untramelled that Birkbeck manfully conquered the prejudice of centuries and with his clear sight succeeded in penetrating into the genuine Russia, Russia as she is in herself, far removed from the pettyfogging and the mirages of the

diplomats. New prospects were opened before him of a people and a country limitless in the breadth of its majesty and incomparably touching in its simplicity and sincerity. With unusual wisdom Mr. Birkbeck understood that one must leave the field of international complications, that one must approach closely the very soul of a people which is working out its historical mission — not to the detriment of and in opposition to other peoples, but in the Name of the Lord, merciful to all, directing all towards the sublime cosmic goal. And in this perspective of sympathetic spontaneity Russia captured the heart of Birkbeck instantly and completely; he loved her profoundly, remaining to his last hour her faithful knight.

There was no whim in this devotion, no unaccountable, unreasoning infatuation. Mr. Birkbeck appreciated all the happenings of Russian life with sane discrimination. He knew well all her weaknesses. He was sorrowful for her vices, though when visiting Russians he never showed anything but a gentleman's gratitude towards his hosts. Yet his compassion and his discouragements were real. He actually suffered physically from all Russia's disorders and failures. He actually rejoiced at her good fortune. For instance, he was truly saddened by the drunkenness of the masses, and during his last visit he had the solace of observing personally the disappearance of this terrible evil. He talked about this enthusiastically to many people, though personally he was no pedantic total abstainer. It was a great triumph for his devoted faith in Russia, whose honour he guarded as a sacred trust from all unjust attacks from wherever they came and whenever they arose.

Having beheld Russia in this new light of great soul-warming attractiveness, Mr. Birkbeck took up his position which was never shaken later, and on the basis of this position he outlined two chief problems for himself: To know this mysterious country in its untouched beauty

in all intimacy and to show it as such to his own countrymen, so that a lasting spiritual bond should be established between them. This was the direction in which he worked with unswerving insistence throughout the most unpropitious periods of mutual animosity and estrangement, and he attained as good results as could possibly be attained on this earth by the efforts of one single man whose only weapons were faith and love. And if today the present alliance with the Anglo-Saxon polity in the sanguinary conflict is upheld and sustained, not by mercantile interests or by commercial and political aims, but rather by a sincere wish to stand for the truth in the name of the holy ideals of humanity, — this we chiefly owe to the great labour of William John Birkbeck. He it was who placed the unshakable cornerstone and prepared a propitious atmosphere in England, arousing her religious sympathy for Russia. For until he began these labours the English were of the opinion that the members of the Orthodox Church were "a sort" of idolaters, or a kind of Roman Catholics, as was testified by the Bishop of London, as recently as 1916.

Adrian Fortescue, the renowned English Catholic, has said that Anglicans perceive at present only the good aspects of the Russian Church, seeing in it their own ideal of Catholicism without the Papacy. If this is so, the merit is wholly Birkbeck's, through whom the truths of Russian Orthodoxy became known.

Mr. Birkbeck's goal was to know Russia in a perfect and authentic way, in her most essential foundations and phenomena. Starting from a sympathetic curiosity, he obtained an all-sided knowledge, proving in his own case the French saying: "*Connaitre c'est aimer.*" It was this love that confirmed him in the conviction that in the case of Russia it was especially true that the popular soul is reflected most brightly in the ancient Orthodox faith, from which it is indivisible. Mr. Birkbeck's own innermost mood was rather analogous, for by nature

he was profoundly religious. The question of Christian salvation in the Church of Christ was most vital, from the very demands of his heart.

Having come across this analogy in a new medium, he concentrated on it his most intense attention. It is not to be doubted that Birkbeck considered Russia as a whole, examining her from all points of view, from the vantage ground of wide information and aided by influential, solicitous friends. Great Russia was dear to him in the broadest sense, and he considered it fortunate that he was able to take part in events of especially Russian character, such as the Coronation of the ex-Emperor and the celebrations of the centennial of Napoleon's invasion. For such occasions he travelled purposely from England. But throughout it all it was in the Church that he beheld the chief elements which define national dignity. Through authentic documents he studied Russian theology, obtaining a thorough grasp of all its refinement and keeping up daily personal intercourse with the most noteworthy representatives of Russia's theological thought. His scientific information in this region was of the solid kind, increasing continually through the study of Russian theological literature in all branches. In it he found knowledge rationalizing the phenomena contained in the religious faith itself and culminating in the intercommunion of Christians with God through the sacraments. In this atmosphere alone were true understanding and vital religious communion possible for him. He considered that the real action of Christianity in this world was in the life of the believers in Christ through grace, and this was what he perceived in the Orthodox Church of Russia, finding that in her a mutual communion, not theoretical but vital, was possible. The late friend of Russia was above all a devotee of Russian Orthodoxy which he untiringly strove to grasp both in its outward manifestations and in the practices of its church services.

Having acquired a mass of information in church history, archeology and liturgics, Mr. Birkbeck took great care to supplement this by direct observation and with this object visited Russia more than twenty times, making prolonged stays and travelling most extensively in all the interesting nooks and corners, heroically accepting most uncomfortable conditions. Possessing a very acute and exact faculty for observation, a clear memory and the power of keen generalization, he acquired an accumulation of precious data neither superficial nor temporary, but distinguished by their depth and their documentary foundations. By birth having at his command personal connections in the highest spheres of Russia and England, Mr. Birkbeck was wonderfully simple in demeanor, approaching with rare openness all kinds of good people, in all ranks of the social ladder. His spontaneous sincerity never failed to be met as spontaneously at all times and in all places, and this opened for him all the sacred places of religion of the Russian type. For instance, the Raskolniki (sectarians) of every shade, considering this alien to be a heretic, devil-ridden as such, nevertheless were able to hold long conversations with him, very willingly discussing with him the most pressing religious questions. They even admitted him to their most exclusive religious acts, stipulating one condition only, which was "that he should not make the sign of the Cross with three fingers" [the "pinch" of the Established Church Russians], so that Mass "should not be spoiled."

All this direct observation and personal experience aided him in arriving at a true conception of living Orthodoxy in the light of every kind of juxtaposition and in strict proportion with the interaction of historical and material conditions. Never having any occasion to practice his Russian at home, Mr. Birkbeck spoke rather slowly, but his knowledge of modern Russian and of the Church Slavonic was very subtle, and he was able to appreciate the smallest shades of difference. Russian

service books were known to him with all the details in the Slavonic texts, which he loved for their picturesque inspired impressiveness so much that he was most fond of reciting from memory many a typical fragment and sonorous quotation; and when he was at home on his ancestral estate he was often heard reading out whole services in the Church Slavonic, when possible with the corresponding paraphernalia. Mr. Birkbeck really did go into the Russian Church service both with mind and with heart, thrilled with sacred admiration.

There was no greater solace for him than to pray in the ancient Uspensky Cathedral of Moscow and to listen to the quaintly majestic unison singing of the priests, especially on the eve of Assumption Day. He simply went into raptures over it, saying that the powerful basses of the cathedral priests were those of the Sons of Thunder. Mr. Birkbeck especially loved the Passion Week and the Russian Easter, spending on his feet hour after hour in our churches. He was always regretful at the termination of the service, though on such occasions his health was constantly endangered. For the sake of these services alone he visited Russia many times. This was the case on his last visit at the end of April, 1916, in spite of the fact that both of his sons had gone to the trenches as volunteers, that his young son-in-law had been brought home seriously wounded from Gallipoli, and that over his property the German airmen appeared repeatedly, throwing down deadly bombs. The stately ritual of the Russian service attracted Mr. Birkbeck irresistibly, and as a highly educated musician he appreciated its music and took a special course of study in Moscow from the director of the teachers of Church singing in the Synodal School, S. V. Smolenski. He studied both the melodies of the Orthodox and of the Raskolniki. However, the important part of divine services for him was their religious efficacy, and in this connection he especially valued the integrity of the exalted

church mood. For that purpose he always attended the sacred cycle of worship in the same church, so that the increasing impression, with its salutary influence should not be disturbed. He was so profoundly moved by the offices of our churches that his feelings were comparable to the heavenly raptures of the Russian envoys sent by St. Vladimir to Constantinople to learn about Christianity, who said that listening to the service in the Cathedral of Sancta Sophia was like being in Paradise; Mr. Birkbeck did so long to see the cross of the Orthodox over the Sophia Cathedral. In this case Sophia is not a woman's name but a designation of the Wisdom of God — the Divine Logos, the Son of God, Jesus Christ.

The late Mr. Birkbeck paid due attention to the special manifestations of general piety in Russian Monasticism, with which he was intimately acquainted— one can almost say, throughout the enormous expanse of the Russian country. At one time he went through the hard trials of the novitiate in the distant monastery of Solovki; his memories of this period remained bright to the end, though, for an Englishman of good birth, life in this far-off abode must have seemed especially trying, with its long hours of praying, its severe regulations, the scantiness and crudeness of the food. He acknowledged the historical and the recent good work of Russian monks and he treasured his connection with the worthiest type of the recluse. All the Russian hierarchs of note kept up a vital intercourse and mutual sympathy with this foreigner, as did the best representatives of the educated Russians and the cultured nobility. But the highest appreciation he felt for the common married clergy who perform the duties of their great trust by bringing Christian enlightenment and salvation into the midst of the masses; as an example of missionary achievements among aliens, he always cited what he had seen of the evangelizing work among the converted Tartars on the Volga, where the clergy officiated in the open

air. Memories of that kind he treasured as the best of his life.

The ever-to-be-remembered Father John of Kronstadt (died December 20th, 1908), who was especially fond of Mr. Birkbeck, was considered by the latter as a beautiful incarnation of the Orthodox pastorate of Russia. He always spoke with delight of his first meeting with Father John, on the shores of Onega Lake, where the pastor spent his whole day among the peasants, "doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him" (Acts X 38). But not less than this he treasured another memory of an event which occurred during a trip he took to the far north by land, in the company of a student of the Ecclesiastical Academy of Petrograd. Unexpectedly he was asked to stop with the father of his travelling companion, a venerable old priest in an out-of-the-way, unknown village of the Archangel region. The nameday of his church was being celebrated in the village and the English visitor was so delighted with the dignity and the simplicity of the church rites and patriarchal customs, that he thought it was a great piece of luck that he had unexpectedly met with, for which it was well worth while to travel all the way from England.

In this respect he was greatly gratified by something which happened during his last visit to Russia. At that time he made a special trip to the Holy Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius (which is near Moscow), with the intention of buying there some small silver crosses to be worn by the Orthodox Russian soldiers who made up a whole Canadian regiment of the English army. Other pilgrims, having noticed that the buyer's Russian had an unusual foreign accent, wondered greatly, speaking their wonder unreservedly, and asked of what possible use such a great number of crosses could be to a foreigner. At last Mr. Birkbeck had to explain, adding that he should like to have these crosses blessed at the shrine of St. Sergius.

Here he received great gratification — all this gray mass walked along with him towards the majestic Cathedral of the Trinity, where an unusually moving solemn *Te Deum* was sung, followed by many expressions of good will and many blessings proffered by simple Russian hearts to an aristocratic Englishman. When later on, trembling with animation, he narrated to us the whole occurrence, he said repeatedly: "Here is truly Holy Russia for you!"

He was devoted unreservedly to that Holy Russia!

He truly was a fiery apologist of Orthodox Russia in England, always ready to defend her from accusation, as in the case of the attempts to limit the influence of the Baltic Germans and the Jews, seeing in these attempts only a necessary means of self-defence against feudal exploitation and economic slavery. His heroic action in 1912 will never be forgotten; at this time most unworthy calumnies were circulated in England against Russia *à propos* of the great development of the Orthodox Church among Russian Galicians. Our Austrian opponents invited anybody who wished to do so to come and verify the truth of their insinuations on the spot, most certainly never expecting to come across a single person willing to undertake the risk. Yet Mr. Birkbeck was willing to brave the danger and accepted the challenge; he made a careful round in Galicia of all the most out-of-the-way country churches, and for all the restraint of his indignation in his series "*Religious Persecutions in Galicia*," which appeared in *The London Times* and then as a separate pamphlet (London, 1912), he brilliantly demonstrated that the pressure of the Austrian Polish Roman Catholics weighed with especial heaviness upon Russians in Galicia who by perfectly lawful means endeavored to preserve their oppressed nationality and to secure the freedom of their ancient Orthodox Faith, which burned undimmed and free in great Holy Russia.

It was this aspect of religious Russia that Mr. Birkbeck wished to represent to England, making the two

countries intimately acquainted; for he loved Russia with his heart's faithful fervour and in the profound conviction of his mind, gained by direct knowledge and experience and by comparison with other beliefs. Extreme Protestantism repelled him with the dry rationalism of its tendency, which seemed a humanitarian doctrine rather than divine truth; but Romanism, with its well ordered administrative ecclesiastical organization and the brilliance of its picturesque magnificence of cult, fascinated him. Moreover, in it he could have hoped to find support and standards, after which to fashion the desirable transformation of Anglicanism. In his youth Mr. Birkbeck was an advocate of the so-called Oxford Movement, which endeavoured to rid his Church of the later Protestant strata and misunderstandings, wishing for it greater independence from secular power and greater security of inner autonomy, so that the earlier Catholic purity of faith and ritual might be re-established. In this respect its votaries kept up a persistent struggle until quite recent days, a struggle which often assumed a tragic aspect; and the late Mr. Birkbeck, always in the very centre of the cause, at times felt profoundly depressed with the hopelessness of his difficult undertaking. Lighting tapers and burning incense as signs of reverence before God and the saints brought forth indignant protests and were branded as idolatry. And the use of ecclesiastical vestments nearly caused imprisonment of offenders. As a matter of fact, Mr. Birkbeck wished the ritual worship of his Church not to border on mere religious gatherings but to be a true realization of the Apostolic commandment to the faithful—"Glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's;" (I Cor. VI 20)—when the whole being of man participates in worship in honour of holy men as of those who guide us towards communion with God through Christ and the Holy Spirit, creating for the worship of man a setting of mysterious holiness, lifting him from earth into

heaven. Catholicity easily justified its ancient imposing ceremonial, with its captivating effect on the masses. And, indeed, Mr. Birkbeck approached it very closely on this side. He was in close contact with the authoritative Roman circles, both in England and abroad; he was in frequent intercourse with the French Roman Catholics, especially those with Gallican tendencies; he was personally known to both the Popes, Leo XIII and Pius X, though his admiration was aroused rather by the pure piety of the latter than by the political designs of the former; with Cardinal Rampolla he was quite intimate, spending whole evenings conversing with him when in Rome, attracted not so much by the learning as by the true religiosity of the Cardinal. Yet the brilliance of Romanists only confirmed the sympathy of Mr. Birkbeck for the humbleness of the Orthodox. It is rather significant that in this respect he put in juxtaposition the Roman Catholic Thomas Aquinas and the Orthodox Father John of Kronstadt, pointing out that the first reasoned in a rational way, whereas the second grasped with his inner feeling; the former imitating Christ, the latter living in Christ.

This contrasting placed Orthodoxy in a favourable light, towards which end Mr. Birkbeck unceasingly laboured, acquainting his country with the history of the Russian Church, its Church ritual, and living practice, being especially anxious to brush away ancient perplexity and the obstinate prejudice which depicted Orthodox Russia in the sight of England in the gloomiest colours as the kingdom of fanaticism, of scientific destitution, empty church ritualism, semi-heathen idolatry, and moral baseness. In this respect Mr. Birkbeck's literary activity was most lively, always endeavouring to adopt forms most acceptable to the English, as is witnessed by his book *Russia and the English Church during the Last Fifty Years* (London, 1895). He translated Russian works on the subject of Anglicanism, as, for instance, *The Question*

of Anglican Orders, by Professor A. I. Bulgakoff; *The Hierarchy and the Anglican Episcopal Church*, by Professor V. A. Sokoloff; also he published numerous treaties of his own: *The Idea of a National Church*, *The Reunion of Christendom*, *Hindrances to Christian Unity*, *A Russian Mission to the Mohammedans*, *Cardinal Vaughan and the Russian Church*, *Possibilities of Intercommunion with the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church*, and many others. In fact, he never failed to raise his voice wherever Orthodoxy needed explanation or justification.

Labour of a negative kind in his case was parallel to and indivisible from constructive effort tending towards the clearing of the atmosphere without unduly influencing anybody merely by the use of "enticing words" (I Cor. II 4). He endeavoured to show his subject in the true light, disposing others to look at it with open eyes. Mr. Birkbeck's motto in this respect was "Come and see" (John I 46). He fervently trusted the salutary effect of such direct and personal contemplation of the subject. With this object in view he made use of every feature of ecclesiasticism capable of putting his people in communion with the authentic life of Orthodoxy. By means of the small choir of the Russian church in London he repeatedly organized, both in London and in Norwich, concerts with most carefully chosen programmes, accompanied by introductory addresses and explanatory references by the Russian performers, so that English audiences listened, their moods carefully prepared to enable them to take in the very atmosphere of Russian divine services. Of course, all this was extremely insufficient, yet Mr. Birkbeck was perfectly correct in considering that such means were the easiest for developing and confirming moral attraction, which is the best pledge of future *rapprochement* and understanding. The mist of estrangement gradually disappeared, disclosing spacious prospects for free acquaintance in the spirit of mutual respect for the sake of spiritual gain,

before which the most firmly rooted prejudice crumbled and fell down.

In this respect Mr. Birkbeck did great service in making clear the true significance of the cult of the Holy Virgin in the Russian Church, which the Anglicans are only too inclined to mistake for sheer deification, whereas the Roman Catholics reproach the Russians with the neglect of this cult. People were made uneasy by the very titles "Birth-Giver of God" or the "Mother of God," yet Mr. Birkbeck succeeded in skilfully disclosing their profound dogmatical meaning, made sacred by church use and authoritative acknowledgment since the greatest antiquity. Through his influence a circular letter of the Most Reverend Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, and William Maclagan, Archbishop of York, containing the explanation of the doctrine of the Anglican Church concerning certain subjects of faith, sent to Russian chief pastors and elect ecclesiastics, was dated in the following way: "At the Day of the Annunciation of the Most Holy Mother of God, the Ever Virgin Mary, in Year of Our Salvation, 1897", the term "Mother of God" being used in the English text with the consent of both these hierarchs and of John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury. Mr. Birkbeck was very decisive and unswerving in his defence of the introduction of this most important dogmatical term in print and in personal intercourse by every possible argument, even by referring to the practice of the Anglican divine service, in the Christmas Hymn of Charles Wesley, brother of the founder of the Methodist Society, John Wesley (who in spite of the fact, remained an orthodox Anglican). This hymn speaks of the "Offspring of a Virgin's womb — Pleased as Man with man to dwell—Jesus our Emmanuel"; that is, "God with Us". Therefore Holy Mary evidently is the Mother of God. This hymn is sung in every church in England at Christmas, stated Mr. Birkbeck in a most conclusive way, and added, "All four of

our Archbishops during the present century have been on the Orthodox side in this matter, so far as doctrine is concerned." In this case to some extent Mr. Birkbeck enacted for England the part of Cyril of Alexandria, who dispelled the Nestorian apprehensions and cleared the ground for objective understanding. The original of Wesley's hymn reads as follows:

> Christ, by highest heaven adored,
> Christ, the Everlasting Lord,
> Late in time behold Him come,
> Offspring of a Virgin's womb!
> Veiled in flesh the Godhead, see,
> Hail the Incarnate Deity!
> Pleased as Man with man to dwell,
> Jesus our Emmanuel!

Through his endeavour were fostered that sympathy and attraction which are entirely necessary to form the groundwork for theoretical agreement and practical *rapprochement*, for from this soil alone can spring up the fruitful growth of truly creative power. When that was realized Mr. Birkbeck continued working forcibly and unswervingly for the establishment of a lasting Church intercommunion through the vital part one Church took in the events of the other. Needless to say this kind of connection is best accomplished through the representatives of the supreme hierarchy, in whose midst he had numbers of friends and admirers, both in Russia and in England. When the late Metropolitan Antonius travelled to England, in 1897, to represent the Russian Church at the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, this happened chiefly through the initiative of Mr. Birkbeck, leaving indubitable long-lived results in the relations of the two communions. He always made use of every occasion to introduce a personal note in the intercourse of the Russian and the Anglican prelates. As for instance, in the case of American Russian Archbishops, Nicholas, who died Archbishop of Warsaw, December 20, 1915, and Innocent, who at present is the Bishop of

Turkestan. From the hierarchs of the Anglican Church we received many tokens of interest in the shape of solemn epistles on various special Church occasions; as, for instance, on the 900th anniversary of the conversion of Russia; or explanatory letters on questions of principle; as, for instance, on the validity of Anglican Orders, at the time when Pope Leo XIII sent his Encyclical on the subject. We also received quite frequently special delegations to Russia of the chosen members of the Anglican hierarchy: Bishop Mandell Creighton, in 1896, who came to be present at the Coronation of the ex-Emperor; William Maclagan, Archbishop of York, who came in 1897; then Charles Grafton, Bishop of Fond du Lac, who came in 1903; and the Bishops of Wakefield, of Ossory, of Exeter, and of Bangor, in 1912. All of these participated personally in significant Russian religious ceremonies, becoming personally familiar with our divine service and ritual. They saw at close range the religious life of the people, examined churches, monasteries, monuments of antiquity. They visited schools and places of learning, held conversations with head pastors and eminent theologians about important dogmatical and ecclesiastical subjects, tying throughout it all living bonds of intimacy between the Churches.

And it is known to a certainty that in all these events without exception Mr. Birkbeck was the original advocate, inspirer and organizer. Every written document of this category either was composed or edited by him throughout all the shades of phraseology and terminology, preserving the strictest objectiveness and conforming to the purpose in view in the most efficacious way. But even in this sort of activity Mr. Birkbeck never pretended to hold the dignity of a spokesman of his Church; Anglican hierarchs in person all spoke in its name, he merely inciting the latter to make their addresses, pointing out to them the most important questions from the Russian point of view, introducing corre-

spondingly his own directions and corrections, never allowing himself to utter the slightest murmur of usurpation or forced interpretation. In the same way and spirit were guided the answers and responses of the Russians. From the very initial stages the visits of Anglican hierarchs to Russia owed much to the energy and wisdom of Mr. Birkbeck throughout all the time they lasted, and in their minutest complications. These demanded especially great skill in order to become actual brotherly communion in Jesus Christ, towards which end many obstacles were to be overcome, sometimes of the most unexpected and complicated nature, both among the English and among the Russians. And I am able to state with perfect satisfaction that all these visits were crowned with blessed success, implanting and strengthening the living Church bond towards the wished-for unity of all under the headship of Christ, to use the beautifully apposite expression of the ever-to-be-remembered Father John of Kronstadt, when he spoke in the English Embassy Church of Petrograd, in February, 1896, on the occasion of the visit of Bishop Wilkinson. Given the mutual understanding and attraction, the communion of faith in church worship became as befitting in place as in time.

Having greatly laboured to acquaint himself with the Orthodox Russian divine service which always evoked in him enthusiasm and devout emotion, Mr. Birkbeck made an extreme effort to graft certain peculiarities of the Orthodox Church on Anglican religious practices. First he succeeded in interesting his fellow countrymen in the Prayers for the Dead, the soul-stirring hymns like the *Contakion*. For the first time at an Anglican rite these hymns were executed at the prayers for the repose of Emperor Alexander III, in the presence of Queen Victoria, who liked them so much that they were made part of the English divine service. June 12, 1916, when Whit Monday fortunately coincided for Russia and for England,

these two hymns were touchingly sung in the Cathedral of Norwich, at the funeral of Mr. Birkbeck himself like a prayerful farewell greeting of the Russian Church to the beloved friend of Orthodox Russia.

In 1898 he published the whole *Pannykhida*, in which the following dirge or *Contakion of the Faithful Departed* is sung in his own translation, adapted to the Russian Chant:

"Give rest, O Christ, to thy servant with thy saints, where sorrow and pain are no more, neither sighing but life everlasting. Thou only art immortal, the Creator and Maker of man; and we are mortal, formed of the earth, and unto earth shall we return: for so thou didst ordain when thou createdst me, saying, Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return. All we go down to the dust and weeping over the grave we make our song, Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!"

During the present war he succeeded in having his arrangement of the Russian *Troparion — O Lord save thy people* sung in Windsor Chapel in the presence of the King and Queen, under the name of "A Prayer for the Russian Church and Nation".

And thus having penetrated into the aristocratic and court circles of England, the peculiarities of Russian divine service immediately acquired an authoritative sanction granting their future free circulation in the whole country. The practice of the Church of England has not so far accepted much of it, but the significant part of it lies in the principle,—the English Church having agreed to make use of our prayer for the dead and our national hope of salvation as a commonwealth under the Cross of Christ, both of these being quite essential in the dogmatic as well as in the national confession. For Mr. Birkbeck both these events had especial value, for in them he saw a gage for the future harmonious worship of God with "a single heart and a single mouth" through the Orthodox service in which he found spiritual consolation in many crises of his life. Mr. Birkbeck was fond of asking Russian priests for special prayers on special occasions in his home—the death of his father, the

marriages of his children, etc. And after his own death there was a service in his memory in the Russian Church in London "to which" in the words of his widow, "we all went, and it was a great consolation to us in our great grief."

Parallel to hymns and prayers, various Orthodox usages also were introduced and accepted, as for instance, the use of vestments, incense burning, the lighting of wax tapers on the altar, standing in church, facing East, keeping pre-sanctified gifts to administer communion to the sick, and to some extent the admission of holy images, partly in the shape of Russian ikons purchased in great quantities. Some Anglicans perceived in all this an invasion of unnecessary ritualism which they firmly opposed; others, especially of late, tried to make use of it for further importations of the Roman ceremonial with Roman influence and papal spirit. There were a good many people of this second category and their agitation greatly disturbed the late Mr. Birkbeck to his last days. Of one of them he said:

> "He is in fact like the patriarch Jacob, a man with two brides. He loves both the Eastern Church and Rome, and, moreover, the Eastern Church is his 'Leah' while his 'Rachel' is the party of extreme Romanizers which are doing so much mischief in the Church of England at the present time."

The danger lay in the fact that the propaganda of the Romanizers was conducted in England under the cover of universal orthodoxy by the means of Apostolic tradition. Wise precautions were needed not to allow the introduction of Russian ecclesiastical customs to become a support for the ascendency of Roman influences in Anglicanism, but to permit it to be only a kind of preparation for union in faith and prayer. For in this preparation Mr. Birkbeck saw the best guarantee of his innermost Christian hope which he significantly expressed at the time of last English delegation to Russia, in January, 1912, satisfying the request of some of his Russian correspond-

ents for his autograph by inscribing the Greek words from the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom:

Ἀγαπήσωμεν ἀλλήλους, ἵνα ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ὁμολογήσωμεν.

("Let us love one another, in order that we may confess in oneness of mind.")

The case was chiefly concerned with the pre-sanctified gifts, for this matter first of all demanded a clear understanding of the Russian faith in Transubstantiation which the Roman Catholic Scholasticism accepted with far too materialistic an interpretation. But as Mr. Birkbeck announced, in the spirit of Orthodoxy:

"I believe that, in the Eucharist, under the Sacramental species of bread and wine, the faithful partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and unto everlasting life. And for the further elucidation of the mystery I appeal to the belief and practice of the ancient undivided Catholic Church of Christ, as they appear in the primitive liturgies and the writings of the Fathers of the Church."

The significance and influence of Mr. Birkbeck's labour has been long since acknowledged and it did much good both in Russia and in England where he was an universal and unquestioned authority in all questions about Orthodoxy in general and especially of the Russian Orthodoxy. It was through his influence that the University of Oxford invited, in 1914, Hilarion Vasdekas, Hiero-Deacon and a graduate in theology in the Ecclesiastical Academy of Petrograd, to examine the English students in similar subjects; and that the University of Cambridge invited Mr. Birkbeck to give a whole systematic course in Russian Church History with a view to which, during his last visit to Russia, he made a careful collection of the special literature on the subject. Mr. Birkbeck offered the whole of his talents, his knowledge, and his connections tirelessly and disinterestedly, nobly and worthily to the service of his country and of Russia, where he was beloved with tender affection, where peo-

ple called him "Ivan Vasilievich" — John, son of William, in the Russian way, as if in caressing acknowledgment of his being one of us; when he was among Russians he was fond of giving that name when introducing himself. Although a typical Englishman of good birth, possessed of all the prerogatives of the true culture of his race, in spirit Mr. Birkbeck was Russian, working to the end at the conversion of his fellow countrymen to a convinced respect for Holy Russia; he wrote to us February 2, 1916:

"My object through all these years has been to get people here to understand what the Orthodox Church really is."

To this subject was dedicated his last treatise concerning the doctrine of the Russian Church, one of the series of readings organized by him in the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, in the City of London, delivered on the four Fridays in March, 1915, and published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The title of these readings was as follows: *The Russian Church: Lectures on Its History, Constitution, Doctrine, and Ceremonial, Prefaced by the Lord Bishop of London.*

In this treatise Mr. Birkbeck stated that

"The Orthodox Church stands for 'the faith once delivered unto the saints', and does not admit of the possibility of subsequent additions to or subtractions from it. At first sight it would appear that it is very much the position taken up by the Oxford Tractarians, and I remember that a well-known Oxford theologian . . . wrote to me that it was practically indentical in principles with those set forth in Dr. Newman's *Via Media.* This is not quite the case. It may in some ways be true theologically, and it is doubtless true historically, to say that the Church of England is a *Via Media* between Rome and Protestantism. But this is certainly not true of the Eastern Church. She neither historically had any part in the troubles which overtook the Western Church in the sixteenth century, nor has she ever regarded herself theologically as a *Via Media* between those contending parties. On the contrary, she looks upon Romanism and Protestantism as parts of the same thing, the latter, namely, Protestantism, logically following upon the former — two aspects of the same error, that error being the rejection of the authority of the Universal Church, under the influence of rationalism, and the substitution in its place of other authorities, more or less conventional." (pp. 34 – 35.)

But in essence, according to Russian theology,

"the Church is not merely an institution, differing only from other institutions, such as the State, in being a spiritual instead of a secular institution; it is something much more than this. It is a living organism of faith and love, or, as one of them puts it, 'faith and love as an organism', the Body of which Christ is the Head and of which all those who have been, are, or shall be brought into it are members, fulfilling itself indeed in time, but nevertheless constituting not an imaginary or allegorical, but a true and substantial unity. It is to the whole Body, and not to the hierarchy apart from the rest of the Body, that the custody of the faith is committed." (p. 36.)

Hence the

"invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, in fact, form merely a portion of the natural intercessions of all the members of the one Body for one another. . . . Mutual intercessions are at once the expression and the condition of this love, and indeed constitute the lifeblood of the Body, coursing through the members and quickening the being." (p. 49.)

In this direction

"the separation between the visible and the invisible world seems to be non-existent. . . . The language used in the poetical addresses to the Saints in the Eastern service books may at first startle Westerners who are not accustomed to it, but when analyzed is found only to be an expression of faith in the efficacy of the prayer of the righteous, and does not differ in kind from requests of the same sort to the living." (pp. 54, 55.) "Mutual prayer is the blood of the Church, and glorification of God her breath." (p. 61.)

Mr. Birkbeck was firm in the confession of Apostolic Orthodoxy, and he highly valued her catholic stability, even in those points where others could not see anything but obstinacy and retrogression. To us he stated directly:

"If *Filioque* is admitted into the Symbol it must either be received on the authority of the Roman Church, or else on the ground that it can be proved from passages of Holy Scriptures and the Fathers. In one case you would commit yourselves to the Papal claims, in the other case you admit the claims of Protestantism to decide what is to be believed quite irrespectively of the authority of the whole Catholic Church. Therefore you never could allow any Church to retain *Filioque* in the Symbol and at the same time be in communion with you."

Russian theology is in perfect accord with this formula, which expresses her conviction and her attitude with so much faithfulness and exactitude.

By his religious attitude and inner devotion Mr. Birkbeck in spirit belonged to Russia where the Gospel testimonial can in good faith be applied to him (Luke VII 4–5): "He loveth our nation and he hath built us a synagogue," (though in this case the synagogue was not built by the hand of man but was a temple of spiritual union in faith, love and piety) and thus has made himself "worthy that the Most High should grant unto him a great and rich mercy, taking him to the dwelling of the just," in which words Russian priests begin the Prayer for the Dead. Mr. Birkbeck found great solace in the fact that on the tragic death of Lord Kitchener the Russian Church, of her own free will, ordered prayers for "the servant of God, Horatio." But his own services were such that the Orthodox prayer of the Church and the worshippers was only what he deserved— "The Lord rest him with his own saints" in the radiance of the never-dimmed Truth, for which he worked so zealously "in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity." (I Tim. IV:12.)

In the words of a person who was the nearest to him, Mr. Birkbeck "really lived for the object of making his own Church to which he was so loyal understand the Eastern Church better." He died a faithful Anglican, always complying with all the religious duties of his inherited confession. At home he was a warden of his church at Norwich and he was so eager to do what this position required that on one occasion he left Russia in a hurry to return to his country home only because some ancient custom demanded his personal presence in the local church on a certain day. Yet it is none the less correct to say that in Russia, among Russians, he was truly one of them, and was considered by them truly Orthodox in conviction and disposition, in dogmatical belief and ritualistic sympathy.

The attitude indicated finds the best commentary in Mr. Birkbeck's own words, sincere and Christianly noble:

"The object is not to make Anglicans of the Russians nor Easterns of the English, but to get them to understand one another better. Our teaching, our history, our modes of thought: this if pursued on the charitable lines with which intercourse between Russian and English Churchmen is at present so happily conducted, is the surest way of drawing our Churches nearer to one another, and to consummation of that ultimate object we all have at heart—the restoration of communion between our Church and the Orthodox East." (*op cit.*, p. 63.)

Therefore Mr. Birkbeck's convictions never allowed him to approve of theoretically reasoned church agreements and he was not in a hurry to arrange "intercommunions", preferring to work quietly for this salutary goal, waiting with pious confidence for the day when the Lord crowns the zealous and inspired efforts of humanity. In this we also see the reason why he never formally joined Orthodoxy, to which he belonged in his soul, though this inner mystery of his heart was never approached by a single one of his Russian friends who never demanded explanations. Our late friend believed that "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him" (Acts 10:35). A solitary hurried change of communion would merely have been a condemnation of his own Church, well able to create scandal, rather than disposition and readiness for the wished-for union. In any case it would be merely a personal matter, as an instance of which the conversion to Romanism of Dr. Newman remains to this day. Moreover, such an act would have been further complicated by the profound tragedy of a religious rupture with those who were nearest to him.

Shocks of this kind, hardly likely to insure the integrity of his peace of mind, were not necessary to make him great in his importance and influence in the achievements of intercommunion-relations. In the whole course of history none has laboured so greatly as Mr. Birkbeck for the realization of religious communion between Russia and England, on the grounds of truth, salutary and necessary for both. He has laid firm foundations in

mutual acknowledgment and attraction and by really and actually bringing the two into touch with one another. He has gone from our midst, but his untimely death, lamented in prayer by all his friends in his own country and among the Russians, will become a source of vital inspiration and glad beliefs for all true Christian hearts. In future William John Birkbeck shall remain a guiding light for self-sacrificing Christian endeavour along the sacred way on which, in the word of our Divine Teacher, "we all shall be one."

THE
CONSTRUCTIVE
QUARTERLY

The Church of Scotland and the Whole Church Catholic

From the Closing Address of the Moderator of the General Assembly of 1917.

[The Moderator, the Right Rev. James Cooper, D.D., Hon. Litt. D., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow, in a letter to the editor used these words: "I was immensely gratified [to have] your very kind letter regarding my Moderatorial Address to the late General Assembly, with the request that I would allow you to reproduce parts of it in The Constructive Quarterly. You do me a great honour, and I am only too glad to permit you to make what use of it you like.

Reunion has been the dream of my life, since I was a boy at school: I have hardly ever done or said anything without having that great aim and hope before me, and I think I have not lived in vain if I have been permitted to further the fulfilment of our dear Redeemer's prayer. To save delay I have written to Blackwood—the publishers—to send you a copy of my Address. May I add that I have been already in Ireland, advocating this cause from the pulpit of Belfast Cathedral (Church of Ireland), and that I am invited

to do so in London, in the crypt of St. Paul's, with the Bishop of London in the Chair. The feeling of the *need* for union is spreading everywhere, and I came to the Moderator's chair at a favourable time for giving it utterance: for which I humbly thank God."

In view of the above permission those parts of the Address are reproduced which most strikingly and constructively present the attitude of the author toward the general title given above, and they follow this note under the original title.

THE EDITOR]

Our Sacred Heritage

I believe that in the Church of Scotland there have come down to us certain assets, material and moral, intellectual and spiritual, of immense value (were they but fully realized) not for our own members only, or for Scotland alone, but for other countries also, and other Churches, and indeed for the whole Church Catholic. . . .

I.

I speak of our National Church. Need I add that I do not think, or dream of thinking, that the Church of Scotland, greatly as we love her, is the whole Church of GOD, even in this land? Only last week, at our Communion Service in S. Giles', we confessed "with one heart and with one voice" our belief in "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."[1] We think of the Church of Scotland precisely as Bishop Gore has been telling us he thinks of his own communion, the Church of England, "as only a portion of a larger whole which embraces and controls it." "What I believe in," the Bishop proceeds, "is not the Church of England, but the One Holy Catholic Church."[2] Exactly so with us. We believe the

[1]Nicene Creed, always said at the Assembly's Celebration of Holy Communion.

[2]*The Religion of the Church*, p. 165.

Church of Scotland to be a part of the Catholic Church, possessing all the rights, and owning the due subordination, which that high and blessed privilege involves. Were it not so, we should be condemned out of our own *Confession of Faith;* which, in language that is as usual a good deal clearer, and stronger too, than anything in the English formularies, defines alike "the Church invisible"—"the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under CHRIST the Head thereof,"[3]—and "the Church visible on earth" as well, to be "Catholic or universal"; and declares the latter to be "the Kingdom of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the House and Family of GOD, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."[4]

The Catholic visible Church, then, is neither a republic nor a democracy. It is a Kingdom, in which CHRIST is King, reigning *in perpetuo; set* by HIS FATHER *on* HIS *holy hill;* Whom the Church must obey as her *one Master;*[5] Whom the *kings* and *the judges of the earth* are bidden *kiss, lest HE be angry.*[6]

"Unto this Catholic visible Church," our *Confession* goes on, "CHRIST hath given the Ministry, Oracles, and Ordinances of GOD, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, unto the end of the world; and doth by HIS own Presence and SPIRIT, according to HIS promise, make them effectual thereunto."[7] "HIS own Presence," mark you! CHRIST HIMSELF is the true Ordainer, as HE is the true Baptizer; HIS Ministers are not the vicars of an absent LORD: they are the visible servants of ONE Who, Himself invisible, is *with them all the days unto the end of the world.*[8]

Three things, in the Church Catholic, it is here affirmed, are of Divine appointment, and therefore by man unalterable.

---

[3] *Confession of Faith,* XXV. 1.
[4] *Ibid.,* XXV. 2.
[5] S. Matth. xxiii. 8.
[6] Psalm ii. 6–12.
[7] *Confession of Faith,* III. 3.
[8] S Matth. xxviii. 20, R.V.

(1) The "Oracles of God," including obviously alike His Word *written* in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and the *Faith once for all delivered to the saints*,[9] which in full accordance with those Scriptures was by God's good providence "embodied in the Catholic Creeds and dogmatic definitions of the undivided Church." Every word of these creeds and dogmatic definitions is enshrined in the Confessions and the Catechisms—I will add also in the modern authorized hymn-books—of the Church of Scotland; nor is she likely to suffer one of those "grand asseverations" to be altered or withdrawn. She holds, as she has held through all her history from S. Ninian her first apostle, the full Catholic tradition of the Faith. She holds it as the very truth of God, which it is hers not to alter but to live by.

Nay; she recognizes very amply the place and authority of Councils: "It belongeth to them ministerially to determine controversies of faith; and . . . to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship and government of His Church . . . which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission; not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God appointed thereunto in His Word.[10] As a matter of fact not only the "determinations" of the great Councils, but many of their "rules and directions" too, are in force with us at the present day.

(2) In like manner with the "Ordinances of God"—"the Word, Sacraments and Prayer." These the Church of Scotland teaches her children to know as "the outward and ordinary means whereby"—not we do something, but—"Christ," the living, active, Divine and Human Saviour,—now "communicateth to His people the benefits of redemption." The Sacraments in particular she describes as "holy ordinances instituted by

[9] S. Jude 3, R.V.

[10] *Confession of Faith*, XXXI. 3.

Him, wherein by sensible signs CHRIST, and the benefits of the new Covenant, are represented, sealed, and *applied* to believers."[11]

Her language on "the two Sacraments ordained of CHRIST" is certainly as strong against "the vanity of those that affirm Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs" as anything in the *Book of Common Prayer*. "No: we assuredly believe that by Baptism we are engrafted in CHRIST JESUS to be made partakers of his justice [righteousness], whereby our sins are covered and remitted, and also that in the Supper, rightly used, CHRIST JESUS is so joined with us, that HE becometh very nourishment and food to our souls"; and "this union and conjunction which we have with the Body and Blood of CHRIST JESUS in the right use of the Sacraments, wrought by operation of the HOLY GHOST, Who by true faith carrieth us above all things that are visible, carnal and earthly, and maketh us to feed upon the Body and Blood of CHRIST JESUS, Which was once broken and shed for us, Which is now in heaven, and appeareth in the presence of HIS FATHER for us: and yet, notwithstanding the far distance of place there is between HIS Body now glorified in heaven, and us now mortal on this earth, yet we most assuredly believe that *the bread which we break is the Communion of CHRIST'S Body*, and the *cup of blessing which we bless is the Communion of HIS Blood*. So that we confess, and undoubtedly believe, that the faithful, in the right use of the LORD'S Table, do so eat the Body and drink the Blood of the LORD JESUS, that HE remaineth in them and they in HIM;[12] yea, they are so made flesh of HIS Flesh and bone of HIS bones,[13] that as the Eternal GODHEAD hath given to the Flesh of CHRIST JESUS (which of its own nature was mortal and corruptible) life and im-

[11] *Shorter Catechism*, 88, 99.
[12] S. John vi. 56.
[13] Ephes. v. 30.

mortality, so doth CHRIST JESUS His Flesh and Blood, eaten and drunken by us, give unto us the same prerogatives."[14] Nor are these doctrines obsolete among us. In the present century, a minister who had been using at the delivery of the consecrated species the words of the *First Prayer Book of King Edward VI.* was enjoined by the General Assembly to employ instead the forms in our *Directory*—"Take ye, eat ye; this is the Body of CHRIST Which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Him;" "This cup is the New Testament in the Blood of CHRIST, Which is shed for the remission of the sins of many; drink ye all of it."

(3) So, too, in regard to the Holy Ministry. That in one not unimportant detail of it—in "our manner of marshalling our presbyters"—(I here quote a favourite expression of that master in our Israel, the late Dr. Sprott)—we have departed from an ancient, widespread, and, I will add, a useful custom of the Church—that of diocesan Episcopacy—we at once admit. But we believe that in our circumstances our act was not unjustified. We contend, moreover, that our Presbyterian polity is sanctioned by the Word of GOD, and finds support alike in a *catena* of opinions of orthodox divines, and in what recent research has shewn to be the original usage of Churches unquestionably apostolic; and that (whatever some may say) the validity of our Orders is not affected by the change. We should not be here were we not assured of the reality of our Divine Commission. For the rest, the Church of Scotland stands with all historic and Catholic Christianity on the two broad fundamental principles (*a*) that the Christian Ministry is not a man-made thing, but is the gift to His Church of the Ascended SAVIOUR; and (*b*) that it is continued—and can be continued only—by the rite of

[14] *Scots Confession*, 1560, Art. XXI. The Westminster Confession was accepted by the General Assembl of 1647, as "in nothing contrary to the received doctrine of this irk."

Ordination ministered in the power of His abiding Presence and His Holy Spirit by men who have been themselves ordained to it—"men who," in the carefully chosen words of the English Article, "have public authority given them in the Congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."[15]

Our doctrine is distinct: "Christ hath instituted a government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church: to that purpose the Apostles did immediately receive the keys from the hand of Jesus Christ, and did use and exercise them . . . and Christ hath since continually furnished some in His Church with gifts of government, and commission to execute the same when called thereunto. No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Word without a lawful calling. Ordination is always to be continued in the Church. Ordination is the solemn setting apart of a person to some public Church office. Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by the imposition of hands and prayer with fasting by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong . . . preaching presbyters orderly associated."[16] . . . "Baptism and Ordination were sound for substance in the Church of Rome, and [are] therefore to be reformed, not removed." . . . "The receiving of our Ordination from Christ and His Apostles and the Primitive Churches, and so all along through the . . . Church of Rome, is so far from nullifying our ministry or disparaging it, that it is a great strengthening of it, when it shall appear to all the world that our ministry is derived from Christ and His Apostles by succession of a ministry continued for 1600 years. And that we have a lineal succession from Christ and His Apostles."[17] In 1698, the General Assembly, for the Vindication of

---

[15]Article XXIII.

[16]*Form of Church Government* approved by the General Assembly, 1645.

[17]*Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici.* London, 1654, pp. 43–45.

the Church of Scotland from the Calumny of Thomas Gipps, Rector of Bury, who had publicly charged "the Presbyterians (particularly those of Scotland) as corrupters of the Word of GOD . . . with a design to support the people's power in setting up ministers for themselves," . . . passed an Act "unanimously declaring that they allow no power in the people, but only in the pastors of the Church to appoint or ordain Church-Officers."[18] . . .

We can well defend the validity of our Orders. It is for each presbyter among us to lay to heart the injunctions of S. Paul to Timothy, *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee . . . with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,*[19] . . . *Make full proof of thy ministry;*[20] and to see that he bears manifest upon him the marks of his apostolic lineage in the gravity, sincerity, unselfishness of his life; in a holy and unblamable behaviour; in the *labour and travail*[21] wherewith he preaches *the Gospel of GOD;* in pastoral faithfulness; in the care and reverence wherewith he ministers the holy Sacraments. . . .

Take another part of our Catholic inheritance. In virtue of our being not schismatics or "heretics, but Catholics and Christians,"[22] we—no less than the larger parts of the Church—are heirs of a vast treasure accumulated by our fathers and brethren in CHRIST throughout all the Christian centuries for the whole body of the faithful. "Every Church," it has well been said, "and in particular every National Church, ought to feel its way to continuity with the whole past of Christianity through and beyond the Reformation and Mediæval periods, right up to primitive and apostolic times, and so to the foundations laid by CHRIST Himself. There must be no

[18]Acts of the General Assembly, 1698. Act V.
[19]1 Tim. iv. 14, R.V. [20]2 Tim. iv. 5.
[21]1 Thess. ii. 9.
[22]Preface to *Second Helvetic Confession,* adopted by the Church of Scotland, 1566.

gaps in its consciousness of its previous history, no leaps over periods as barren and unfruitful."[23] This sense of continuity the Church of Scotland has never quite lost. Even Davie Deans could go back to "the Culdees," though "he passed from them to John Knox."[24] George Buchanan could say of David I. that he "exhibited throughout his life a better example of a good king than any which the ablest men could think of in their minds."[25] More recently the fair figure of S. Margaret (hardly mentioned even by Sir Walter Scott) has emerged from unmerited oblivion. We owe our parochial system, all our great churches, and this General Assembly itself, to the piety and wisdom of the Middle Ages. Our Universities come to us out of the darkening years that preceded the Reformation. The services of the Covenanters, earlier and later, to the cause of freedom are on all men's lips. The Moderates of the Eighteenth century, once much abused, gave us in *The Paraphrases* an addition to our Psalmody remarkable alike for poetic grace, for orthodox statement, and for evangelical fervour. The Free Church of 1843 revived, for all Scotland, the long torpid grace of giving for religion. We have regained a much fuller sense of continuity; and things like the observance of the Christian Year, which in a time of not unprovoked reaction were laid aside, we are now happily restoring. It was not long after the Reformation ere the question was put, "May the Kirk keep Pasch and Yule?" Even then the sensible answer could be given, "Why not, where superstition is removed?"[26] Such of us as have tried to observe these and the other sacred seasons have found it a most valuable means for the systematic inculcation year by year of the basal facts of the Gospel. There is a mine of devotional treasure in the Catholic

---

[23]Bp. John Wordsworth, *The National Church of Sweden*, p. 438.
[24]*Heart of Midlothian*, Chap. xliii.
[25]*Rerum Scoticarum*, vii. 91.
[26]See Dr. Leishman's pamphlet with this title.

past; and as Catholics we should feel ourselves entitled to dig for it in other gold-fields besides those of Scotland. *All things are yours.*[27] What an admirable counsel was that given by Pope Gregory the Great when S. Augustine of Canterbury asked him: "Why, whereas the Faith is one and the same, are there different customs in different Churches?" "You know, my brother, the custom of the Roman Church wherein you yourself were bred. But it pleases me that if you have found anything either in the Roman, or in the Gallican, or in any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and teach it to the Church of the English which is but new in the Faith. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Choose therefore from every Church those things that are pious, religious, and upright; and when you have as it were made them up into one body, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto."[28] We must, of course, remember that our Church is not "new." We must be careful not to dislodge in ignorance old customs that are more truly Catholic than those we seek to introduce. We must avoid innovations that will hardly go with our sober usages. Still less dare we venture to bring in practices wholly unknown to the *Churches of God.*[29] But there are many things of great spiritual power which we can profitably assimilate. Dr. Bisset, in the first Moderator's Address which I remember reading at the time (1862)—an Address, I may add, that materially contributed to shape my own ministerial course—"approved of innovations, and recommended more." He did so in view of the numbers who on account of the baldness of our service were then leaving our communion for that of the Episcopal Church. I venture

[27] 1 Cor. iii. 21–23.
[28] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, i. 27.
[29] 1 Cor. xi. 16.

to repeat it for a higher reason—the greater glory of Almighty God: that we may make our worship more worthy of His Divine Majesty, and more expressive of those devout and tender feelings which as Christians we learn from the Son of Man, through Whom we are enabled and emboldened to present it.

Another of my distinguished predecessors in this chair, my great and revered teacher Dr. Milligan, whose chaplain I was in 1882, said to me on his deathbed: "The reform in the Church of Scotland which we need above all others is the revival of the Weekly Eucharist." What is there to hinder it? No law of our Church forbids it. There is Scripture for it: the most important text in the New Testament for the keeping of the Lord's Day exhibits the Lord's Supper as the purpose for which the faithful had assembled.[30] One would think sometimes from our practice in regard to it that we were ordained not *to give* our fellow-servants *their meat in due season*, but to withhold it from them![31]

In another great department of Christian work—that of organized service to the poor and needy—we have already, much to our advantage, borrowed an institution from Catholic antiquity. On the initiative of Dr. Charteris we revived the Order of Deaconesses. To Dr. Donald Macleod we owe the helpful addition of the Parish Sister. What should we have done without them in times like these? Ought we not, in view of the enormous development of Nursing, to take a leaf from the France of the Seventeenth century, and offer (at any rate) to the women who choose this profession a systematic course of instruction and training in the spiritual side of their high vocation?

To two of the genuine *old paths* in particular it humbly appears to me that we ought forthwith to revert—as under our present constitution we have ample power to do. I refer to the Apostolic Diaconate, and the no

[30]Acts xx. 7.

[31]S. Matthew xxiv. 45.

less Apostolic *Laying on of hands*[32] in confirmation of the baptismal gift and vow. We are, I believe, the only National Church in the world—Reformed or other—which has laid aside Confirmation; and we are the poorer for the want of it. Then, our system of "probationers" was never good in theory. I do not know any warrant it has in Scripture. The Army authorities are puzzled to know whether our licentiates are in Orders or not, and we ourselves hardly know how to answer them. Our young preachers are left without discipline at the very time when they should be broken in to it. The supply of them is insufficient. They are ill-distributed; there are none at all in wide districts where they are much needed. They have no security for their maintenance. Why should we not lay aside so anomalous a system, and re-introduce the genuine New Testament Diaconate, whereby each local centre had a resident staff of approved men, candidates for the Presbyterate, yet already ordained with the laying on of hands, and appointed not to control the purse (which would have made them masters) but to serve in the distributing of the Church's alms, to learn their life's work as the servants of the Presbytery, and permitted under its direction to preach and to baptize. It is not new inventions our Church is needing, but that she should *ask for the old paths, and walk therein, and find rest unto our souls.*[33] Do you notice how the Prophet anticipates here that precious promise of our Saviour?

Above all, it is in the Church Catholic, as the *one Body*, that we are authorized to look for the teaching, the guidance, and the power of the One Spirit—God the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son, "the Lord and Giver of Life." *The wind*, I know, *bloweth where it listeth.*[34] He "filleth the

[32]Acts viii. 16–17; Hebrews vi. 2.
[33]Jeremiah vi. 6.
[34]S. John iii. 3.

world," to *convict the world.* But it was on the Apostles that HE came. It is in *their fellowship* that HE abides, and dwells as in a temple, to direct and to co-ordinate, as well as to energize, the work for CHRIST, the HEAD of the entire organism. It is *the unity of the SPIRIT*—the unity taught us by the SPIRIT—that we are bidden *give all diligence to keep.* Because *there is one Body, and one SPIRIT, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one LORD, one Faith, one Baptism, one GOD and FATHER of all, Who is over all, and through all, and in all.*[35]

II.

"One Body and One SPIRIT" for Christians of every nation and people and tongue, yet so that it is sent forth to each different nation with power to be in that nation National; to speak so as to be understanded of that nation, and adapt itself (within the necessary limits of fidelity to CHRIST and care for HIS Body as a whole) to the lawful tastes and feelings, the habits and the institutions of that nation.

This is Pentecost week: the season itself reminds us how the sign that the SPIRIT had descended, and was sitting upon each of the Apostles, was that their polyglot audience *heard* their united testimony, *every man in his own tongue wherein he was born.*[36] That the Church in every nation can be in this sense National is just another proof that it is really Catholic, with a mission from GOD to all the nations. We sometimes hear men sneer at what they are pleased to call "geographical Christianity," but the term seems to me eminently Scriptural. The only names I can find in the New Testament designating different portions of the Church are geographical names—"the Churches of Galatia," "the Church at Corinth," "the Seven Churches of Asia." The Church was the same Church everywhere; but it wore a different aspect

[35]Ephesians iv. 3–6, R.V. [36]Acts ii. 1.

in each place according to the peculiar genius of the city or land where it was planted.

Yet here, too, caution is required. Nationalism has its dangers, and these in two directions. If, on the one hand, the Church in any nation learns to deem itself a separate tree, and not a branch simply of the Vine which was planted in Judea and sent out its boughs into all lands: if it makes the genius of the nation to whom it is sent its master rather than CHRIST; and is more anxious to be Roman, or German, or English, or Scottish, than to be Christian: if, again, it takes its stand more on some acknowledgment by the State or inclination of the people than on the revealed will of the LORD JESUS; or if, on the other hand, it exalts its national peculiarities into the rank of Divine laws, insists on their acceptance by the whole world, and makes them a ground of separation from fellow-Christians in other lands,—then, and in so far, that Church sins against a very purpose for which the Catholic Church was founded—that, namely, of being a common spiritual home and training-place for all the nations, wherein they might find a higher unity in the obedience, the worship, the service, and the fellowship of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. It was Isaiah's prophecy: *The mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the GOD of Jacob; and HE will teach us of HIS ways, and we will walk in HIS paths. . . . And HE shall judge between the nations, . . . and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares. . . . Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*[37] It was CHRIST'S acheivement at the first; it is HIS achievement still, did we but realize it, and cease to draw off, on this pretence or on the next, from each other's

[37]Isaiah ii. 2–4, R.V.

fellowship. Together we are, as our *Confession* says, "the family of GOD": "a family is not less one family because its members are not on speaking terms with each other."[38] Ours, not CHRIST'S, are the sin and the reproach. HE broke down the *middle wall of partition*[39] that separated Jew and Gentile: we have busied ourselves in setting up new barriers. It may be doubted whether any purely National Church has been able to interpose an effective veto on a war of aggression begun by its own nation. Even when Catholic unity was unbroken, it was not easy for the Church to bid wars to cease, though she sometimes tried. Unquestionably the breach between the Eastern and the Western Churches in the Eleventh century, and still more the divisions that accompanied the Reformation in the Sixteenth, were responsible for many atrocious conflicts; with the result that since the Peace of Westphalia the statesmen of Europe have heeded in their international politics the voice of none of us: nay, we have ourselves been content for the most part to accept the maxim, "My country, right or wrong"; and so have deprived mankind of a special benefit CHRIST surely intended HIS all-embracing Church to render, that of arbitrating, in HIS Name and in HIS unselfish righteousness, should differences arise among the Christian nations. So far from HIS law, and promise, of Catholic international union and fellowship among HIS followers being a reactionary dream, it is a desire which increased intercourse, and the discoveries thereby made to us alike of our own defects and the merits of the Churches of other nations, were combining to awaken in thousands of Christian souls even before this appalling War came to reveal the absolute necessity for the welfare of humanity of its practical realization. We can have it only by reverting, all of us, to *the pattern shewed us in the Mount*, on that first Pentecost when

[38]Bishop A. P. Forbes, *Charge* on Papal Infallibility, 1870.
[39]Ephesians ii. 4.

the disciples of the LORD were *all with one accord in one place;* and when, in obedience to the SPIRIT sent down upon them, *they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers.*

This is the goal at which every member and every part of the Church must aim. For it is the prayer of the Church's HEAD—*That they all may be one, even as THOU, FATHER, art in ME and I in THEE, that* they also *may be one in Us: that the world may believe that THOU didst send ME.* It is *the glory,* HE adds, *that HE hath given us: that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that THOU didst send ME, and lovedst them, as THOU lovedst ME.*[40]

Yet each National part of the Catholic Church, while keeping this goal in view, ever hastening in conscious zeal towards it, and refusing aught which may divert her into by-paths, has her GOD-given functions towards the nation in which the LORD hath set her as HIS anointed witness. Well may we, Fathers and Brethren, ministers and office-bearers of the Church of Scotland, thank GOD for the special sphere HE has assigned to us: for a land so varied and so beautiful, for a people so strenuous and so intelligent, so strong in their attachments, so perfervid in their spirit, small in numbers, but so keen from the days of Galgacus and the Mons Grampius to defend their national independence, so influential in all lands whither their enterprise has carried them, so capable under the Gospel of deep religious faith, so honoured, alike in early days and in our own, to yield noblest missionaries of the Cross. . . .

The love of freedom has been no less characteristic of the Scottish Church than of the Scottish nation. . . .

How are we using these high privileges?

(1) Our freedom. We are the freest National Church in the world. I sometimes think we are the most hide-

[40] S. John xvii. 20–26.

bound, by fetters of our own making—the cowardly fear of doing things; narrow, illiberal, grudging notions; the bad traditions of a bad period; lazy, irreverent, unlovely customs; personal *inertia;* neglect to obey the wholesome injunctions of the Church; unwillingness to stir one inch beyond the old conventional routine. As ministers we are so far independent of our people: have we felt the more keenly our duty to them and to the LORD to tend them for Him, to feed them *with the sincere milk of the Word*,[41] to guide them rather than be guided by them? And the further freedom for which we have been asking, has it been freedom to deny rather than (as our fathers did) "with free hearts to confess," and gloriously to set forth the cardinal truths and saving ordinances of our most holy Faith? It is our boast that our fathers spake of GOD'S *testimonies before Kings*.[42] Have we, their sons, been bold before democracies and Parliaments in regard, for instance, to the greatest of all social questions, that on which our Blessed LORD, Who would not be *a judge or a divider*[43] of property, did most emphatically legislate?—*For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh. So that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore GOD hath joined together, let not man put asunder*.[44] I do not see that the non-established Churches of this country or America have been a bit more faithful in regard to CHRIST'S law of Marriage than the two Churches established in Great Britain. None of us have much ground for boasting. Yet it may well be over this very thing that the last conflict between the world and the Church will centre. Democracy triumphant will not lightly be baulked of its wayward will.

(2) Our Establishment. Do some of us endanger it by resting our claim to be heard rather on the status it

[41] 1 S. Peter ii. 2.
[42] Psalm cxix. 46.
[43] S. Luke xii. 14.
[44] S. Matthew xix. 5.

affords us than on that Divine Commission which it is the *raison d'être* of Church establishment to honour? Or do we on occasions speak of our non-established or disestablished neighbours as if they had no conscientious convictions; or as if we ungratefully forgot their many services to CHRIST in doing what should have been our work, but which we have been slow, or unable, to fulfil?

(3) Our Endowments. The one valid objection to Church Endowments is their tendency to serve as an excuse for failure in Christian giving. Giving for the LORD'S service is a duty incumbent on us all, whether the church in which we worship is endowed or not: *Honour the LORD with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase.*[45] Provided for ourselves, we should be more able to help others, and to further the immensely important work of Christian Education and Christian Missions.

(4) As the National Church we enjoy a very sacred possession in the parish churches with their old churchyards, and the manses, along with a statutory provision for their necessary upkeep. Being statutory this latter provision cannot be—ought not to be—larger than it is; and many of our churches therefore are severely plain. But they are all redolent with holy memories: they are all the scenes of spiritual privileges whereof Solomon's Temple itself had but earthly shadows. Love should come in to augment the legal obligation, *and make the place of GOD'S feet glorious.*[46] . . .

Our ecclesiastical divisions, no doubt, have much to do with all these evils. What shall we say of these divisions? First, of course, what S. Paul says of them, that their very existence (whatever may have been the cause of them, or whoever may be most to blame for them) is a sign that we, who should be *walking in the Spirit*[47]—*walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost*[48]

[45]Proverbs iii. 9.
[46]Isaiah lx. 13.
[47]Galatians v. 16.
[48]Acts ix. 31.

—*are carnal and walk as men.*[49] Among Christians there should be *no divisions:* we should *all speak the same thing,* and *be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.*[50] We must begin here if we would deal faithfully with the evil: we must humbly confess the sin, if we would obtain GOD'S pardon for it: we must acknowledge the disease, if we would gain courage to endure the remedy. Our divisions are, each and all of them, a sin against CHRIST. They desolate His "kingdom." They mar the peace of the "household of GOD." They alienate from each other the members of His "family." They present to the world a visible Church lamentably different from that which in her early ages evoked the heathens' admiration—"See how these Christians love one another!"

How thankful we should be that all over Christendom people have got sick of sectarianism, and (too lightly, no doubt, in many cases) bid us make haste and come together! For it cannot be lightly done. "Union is not to be obtained," said one of our ablest ministers recently taken from us,[51] "by toning down conviction, or searching for ambiguous phrases." Peace must come through the truth—*the truth as it is in Jesus,*[52] stated, apprehended, grasped with intense realization of the duties it imposes. "When Christians differ," said S. Ambrose, "they should not contend: they should confer."[53] And happily, with one, and that by far the largest of the Scottish Reformed Churches now separated from us, the United Free Church of Scotland, we are in conference already. Progress has been made; we seem to be agreed that the old endowments shall be conserved for the sacred use for which they were bestowed. And if, in our own Committee, certain of the draft "Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland" appeared to some of us ambiguous on

---

[49]1 Corinthians iii. 3. [50]*Ib.* ii. 10.
[51]The late Rev. Dr. Andrew Miller, *The Problem of Theology.*
[52]Ephesians iv. 21.
[53]Quoted by Dunlop, *Harmony of Confessions.*

the subject of the National recognition of the Church, and seriously insecure, and defective, as omitting, for the first time in our history, the terms which are the very hall-marks of Catholic orthodoxy; yet the Assembly of 1914 "recognized the Articles as not final either in content or expression"; and events have happened since which should conduce to a more explicit testimony on both these matters. . . . When peace has been restored, both Churches, it seems probable, will see the whole question in a new light; nor does it seem likely that either in regard to the fundamental doctrines or in regard to the relation between Church and State any revolutionary proposals will find favour with the Scottish people. For myself I believe that a reunion on right principles of these two Churches is not only to be desired on its own account, but is the necessary first step towards other unions not less requisite if the Church of Scotland of the future is to embrace (were it only) all the children of her Reformation. It must not be forgotten that a union with the United Free Church alone would leave still unhealed, on the one hand, the miserable divisions which distract the Highlands; and, on the other hand, our separation from a growing Church whence again and again have come expressions of her desire to be united with us; a Church which has a genuine root in Scotland; which is the special shrine of a tradition at once pious and romantic, a precious element in our National inheritance; a Church whose influence to-day is far greater than her numbers, and with whom reunion is absolutely necessary if we are to have a National Church that shall bring together in united worship all ranks and classes of the people. I repeat in 1917 what was said from this chair in 1882 by Dr. Milligan: "It is vain to say, Let that matter alone. Upon what principle can you let it alone? When Christian union is spoken of, the starting-point must be Christian; and starting from that point, we are not entitled to omit any body of Christians until it is distinctly shewn that the difficulties of conciliating it are insuper-

able. It may be so here, but it has not been shewn that they are so." [54] On the contrary, the Scottish Episcopal Church has been steadily advancing in various ways to positions hitherto our own. Her synods have gained in power: "In 1905 she formally established a Consultative Church Council, in which the laity have the constitutional right of expressing their opinions, and making representations to the bishop on all proposed legislation, and indeed on any subject." [55] She has just made her noble Prayer Book more elastic. Long ago she purged herself from the Erastianism of the Seventeenth century: the last trace of it disappeared the other day when in the fine "Bidding Prayer," just sanctioned, she dropped the clause asserting the King to be "in all causes" supreme, a "grievance" of which (as has been said) we got rid by the Act of 1690.

But it is no longer possible to confine our views to Scotland. Scotland is not a world by itself: she is an integral, and a very influential, part of an Empire, the vastest, freest, and with all its faults surely the most beneficent the world has ever seen. Imperial unity is the political question of the day. The Premiers of the King's self-governing dominions have met to consider how it may be best consolidated. Shall the Church, the Divine Kingdom, for whom unity is an essential law, lag behind the State? Is not the very least that we can offer to our Blessed Lord a United Church for the United Empire—a United Church that shall combine all that is best in our two systems? In the making of the Empire, England and Scotland have been the two chief partners. They have worked loyally together: nor has either lost in the process its individuality or its local patriotism. Why may not the two National Churches do the like? We hear some foolish things sometimes from England; but is it charitable

---

[54] *The Present Position and Duty of the Church of Scotland.* Aberdeen, 1883.

[55] *Reunion between Presbyterians and Episcopalians.* Dean of St. Andrews. Perth, 1917.

to gloat over these? I have no words of reprobation strong enough for those on either side of the Border who try to put ill-blood between us. I well remember a sentence which in 1869 I heard Dr. Norman Macleod utter from the Moderator's chair: "I will be no Old Mortality cutting into fresh distinctness the records of decaying animosities." I doubt, however, if we in the Church of Scotland have given anything like adequate consideration to the latest utterance on this very question of the entire Anglican Episcopate, at the Lambeth Conference of 1908: "That, in the welcome event of any project of reunion between any Church of the Anglican communion and any Presbyterian or other non-episcopal Church which, while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610." [56] This is cautious enough: but have we ever said as much to them? Or have we pondered the other fact, that from the Episcopal Church of America there has since emanated the proposal for a world-wide Conference on Christian Unity? Both we and the United Free Church have entered into this project; and operations will doubtless be resumed as soon as peace has been restored.

A yet wider union already opens to our sight, the one union of which our SAVIOUR speaks—a union of all who believe in HIM. We can no longer think of omitting from the hope of it either the Orthodox Church of the East or the great Roman Catholic Communion of the West, which

[56] *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth, Aug. 5,* 1908, p. 65. Following up this Resolution, two English bishops invited me to visit them and speak to their clergy in the spring of 1909. At the request of Bishop Browne I addressed in the hall of his palace at Bristol a meeting of the clergy of his diocese on "The Precedents of 1610"; and at Salisbury, Bishop Wordsworth asked me to lecture on the Scottish Reformation to the students of the Theological College; and at the meeting of his diocesan Synod assigned me a chief place on the platform.

has all along been missionary, and of whose great work in Scotland—educational, charitable, and among our immigrant populations, Irish, Italian, Polish, Lithuanian—we ourselves are witnesses. Be these Churches ever so much in error; yet we are not bound to suppose that error will endure for ever. And both (we see more clearly every day) have more in them than errors. Thank GOD! neither has ever swerved from the great fundamental truths of Christianity. . . .

The Orthodox Father Nicholas of Serbia has just addressed from the historic pulpit of S. Margaret's, Westminster, the following "Appeal to the Church of England": —"Your Church, embracing very Orthodox and very Protestant elements, is in a position to be an intermediator between all the Churches. You have a vital touch with them all: you have a right understanding of them all: you have sympathy with all of them. Stick to your Church: it is a beautiful and a holy Church. But nevertheless break up every sort of disgraceful exclusiveness from other Churches. You as a nation are living at one end of Europe, but as a Church you have a central position among the Churches of Europe. Your Church therefore has a mission to be the meeting-place and bridge for all the Churches. Through you the Orthodox East can come in touch with the West: through you as by a true mirror, the Roman Catholic Church can see the Living CHRIST even among the Protestants; and through you the Protestants can learn to see the sympathetic and holy aspect of the Roman Church. This is the best way to bring the whole Church out of her present agony and weakness. This is the best way to serve your own Church and your own nation. And the CRUCIFIED does not ask any other service from your Church in the present world-agony." [57]

The same post which brought to me this remarkable address brought me, from a source at once more remote and

[57]Lecture in S. Margaret's, Westminster, 20th March 1917.

humbler, another testimony. A Roman Catholic lady sending a contribution to a friar-missionary in China, asked him and his converts to "make communion" for the unity of Christendom. He submitted the matter to them: they agreed to do it once a month; then once a week; and now he has invited the converts of a wide district to a celebration with this view in the open air on Corpus Christi Day (the 7th of June). "I feel sure," he writes, "they will make a general communion, and offer it with a will for Christian unity; and this to me is perfect joy." "If China prays for us," comments my correspondent—a respected member, I may mention, of the United Free Church—"is not this something of that *lightning* which shall *shine from the East even to the West?*"[58] Is GOD HIMSELF "calling in a new world to redress the balance of the old"?

Say not such things are dreams. They are so many responses of loving and believing hearts, SPIRIT-taught, to the express desire and promise of HIM to Whom alone *all authority hath been given in heaven and in earth,*[59] Who yet, in the same breath wherewith HE declares HIS purpose, repudiates any attempt to put force, or even pressure, on the wills of HIS disciples. HE will not drive, HE will not bribe, HE will not so much as bring HIS sheep: *them also I must lead* (such is HIS gracious word), *and they shall hear My voice; and there shall be one flock, one Shepherd.*[60] It will be doubtless, as it was at the beginning of the Gospel—the seed growing secretly, *the kingdom of God coming not with observation;* because it is the work of the HOLY GHOST, *the Spirit of truth, Whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him. But ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.*[61]

[58] S. Matthew xxiv. 47.
[59] *Ib.* xxviii. 18, R.V.
[60] S. John x. 16, R.V.
[61] Lamentations iii. 40.

A Response to Father Kelly

By T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Divinity, Knox College, Toronto, and a member of the Committee that drew up the Doctrinal Basis of Union.

I have read Father Kelly's article on the United Church of Canada [1] with intense interest, and much admiration. That an Anglican of, I presume, "high" proclivities, should be so kind and fair, in his estimate of a document, emanating from quarters so distant from his own position, is delightful and most gratifying to those who endeavoured to utter their confession of faith, and were conscious of many shortcomings in their attempt. I am not commissioned to speak for them, or to expound the propositions which Father Kelly has examined so searchingly and so sympathetically. I gladly take the opportunity provided me, however, to explain why I, as a Presbyterian, find myself able to join in this Confessional Statement, and ready to enter a community of Christians, which is to make this its doctrinal basis of union.

The problem before the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist communions, is intensely practical. In effect, it is this: Can they do their work in this new country better in the fellowship of one communion than in the present condition of ecclesiastical separateness? Plainly, they cannot, if that separateness is due to dif-

[1] See the September 1917 issue of The Constructive Quarterly, p. 435.

ferences which concern the apprehension of the Gospel itself. Hence, it became necessary, in the process of the negotiations for union, to ascertain if such differences existed.

No one, I conceive, imagined that the time had arrived in God's providence for drawing up a full orbed and thoroughly articulated system of doctrine, such as is contained in the famous Westminster document. All that was thought of was an answer to such questions as these:

Is it the case that Methodists, deriving their origin from the great revival in England in the eighteenth century, and Congregationalists, who are heirs of the great Puritan protest in the seventeenth century, and Presbyterians who have behind them 300 years of national history, are fundamentally at one in their apprehension of the Christian Salvation? Is it true that such intellectual divergencies, as may exist, do not make it impossible that men, claiming entire Christian liberty, may speak, for Christ, to the world, one saving message? What do Methodists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians believe when they are on their knees before God? What is it they declare before men as the Gospel for human sin and need? What do they conceive it to be their duty to teach the rising generation, or the incoming multitudes of alien race who are seeking to find a home in Canada? The document which Father Kelly examines is the answer to such questions as these. It is, accordingly, as he notes, "wholly positive" (p. 451). But it is so only in view of the tenets of the three negotiating bodies. Those who hold "Episcopacy, Apostolic Succession, Transubstantiation, worship of Saints, or the Papacy, to be true and necessary beliefs" are not in view; and the document should surely not be held to permit anything, which it does not explicitly name, and, in detail, refute. It is, consciously and avowedly, an eirenicon as between the three communions concerned. It is not a learned paper, dealing with disputed points of doctrine; and it rigidly eschews polemics.

It seeks to be a statement of an effective salvation, and avoids as far as possible the technicalities of scientific theology. The risk of such attempted simplicity is, of course, obscurity; and the document, under Father Kelly's discriminating eye, reveals defects. I feel almost sure that I could point out others! I am quite sure that it could be improved, perhaps by omissions, possibly by additions, certainly in its English! Yet to my mind, it is a wonderful achievement. Men of diverse ancestry and very different training, few of them experts, many of them business men, most of them working pastors, after weeks of thought and prayer, in meetings held during several succeeding years, found words, in which to utter a common faith and message, which, in their judgment, left out nothing essential to the great mission of the Christian Church in the evangelization of the world. I thankfully concur in it, and will be glad to serve in the communion which has this as the summary of its faith.

Following Father Kelly's divisions, I desire to say how I understand the points to which he refers.

SOURCES OF DOCTRINE.

1. *Scripture.* The epithet "infallible" seems to Father Kelly "a little difficult to justify," and the phrase "a faithful record of God's gracious revelations" seems to him "a definite repudiation" of the modern critical mind. I venture to think that "infallible" is an epithet which may justly be used in reference to the rule of faith and life contained in Scripture; and I am sure that the authors of the document did mean that God's gracious revelations to His chosen servants, and through them to mankind, throughout the Old Testament and the New Testament, are matters of historic fact. If the modern critical view reduces the history to fable or parable, so much the worse for the modern critical view! The Scriptures are the divinely bestowed means, whereby the Christian life

is created and nourished. For such uses, they are divinely fitted; and they are "infallible" in their saving and educative office. Within a believing use of Scripture, scholarly and critical study has not merely room, but right and duty. But any conclusion which shuts God out of Scripture, and leaves in it only confused cries of the human heart, and not His awakening converting voice, and a Father's living word to His children, violates the very foundation of Christianity, and is impossible of toleration by a Christian man, or within a Christian Church.

2. *Tradition.* According to Anglican writers, tradition has "interpretative authority" with respect to Scripture. This tradition is embodied, it would appear, in the creeds of the undivided Church, which, accordingly, have "interpretative authority." Is there any approximation to this view in the document? Does it recognize "that human need cannot stop short with Scripture"? Are its references to the Creeds to be taken as implicitly an acknowledgment of them as being sources of truth supplemental to Scripture, and possessing "interpretative authority"?

I cannot think that the Preamble warrants an affirmative answer to these questions. It seems to me in itself, and in connection with Art. II, to affirm the Sufficiency of Scripture. Its references to the creeds are a claim that, in what follows, the three communions are in harmony with the fundamental beliefs of Christians, in different ages of the Church's history, as these have been uttered in the great crises, when the very essence of the Gospel was being assailed. In the Apostles' Creed, they affirm the saving facts of redemption. In the Nicene Creed, they confess the true deity of the Redeemer. In the Symbol of Chalcedon, they maintain both His humanity and His divinity. With the Churches of the Reformation, they stand for the great principles of that mighty movement, the priesthood of believers and justification by faith. No other creeds are referred to,

because no other crises have arisen which touched such vital matters. But, so far as I can see, there is no hint in the document that the leading of the Spirit is confined to the Reformation Epoch. Article VIII is one of those which might have been more felicitously phrased; but it does assert, however clumsily, the continuous indwelling and inworking of the Spirit within the Church of Christ, without any limitation of space or time. I devoutly believe in "the continuous and progressive activity of the Holy Spirit in history" (p. 437). It was in the belief that the Holy Spirit was leading us, that the Church Union movement was begun in Canada; and we still wait the guidance of the Spirit to direct us in its further development.

FUNDAMENTAL THEOLOGY.

Father Kelly is satisfied, on the whole, with the statements of the document regarding the Holy Trinity, the Divine Purpose, Creation, the Virgin Birth, the Atonement. He asks, however, if any candidate for ordination, who would "not accept the *Homo-ousion*, nor the Virgin Birth," or one who "would not accept the phrase, 'Satisfied Divine justice,'" would be received. Could such a person be regarded as in "essential agreement" with the statement of doctrine? I think that a distinction must be drawn here. The Virgin Birth is a fact of history. If it is not, it has no rightful place in the Creed. The man who denies it has no right to use the Apostles' Creed, or any other creed which contains it, as his personal confession of faith.

We might debate the question, whether a man might hold the Church's doctrine of the Person of Christ, and yet reject the Virgin Birth. But as long as the Virgin Birth holds its place in the Creed, no man should be ordained who denies it. That seems to me a matter of simple honesty and veracity. The case is different, how-

ever, as I view it, with terms of technical theology, like *Ousia*, or *Satisfactio*. A candidate might say: "I accept in the fullest degree to which thought can penetrate the oneness of the Father and the Son; and I unqualifiedly accept the true Divinity of the Redeemer. But I am profoundly dissatisfied with the term *Ousia*, taken over from Greek Philosophy. I regard it as inadequate, and even misleading. I can see how it came to be used at Nicea; and I sympathize with the purpose of those who used it. But I think its retention is harmful, and ought to be abandoned." Ought such a man to be rejected? I trow not! If I were sure of the man's personal attitude toward Christ, I would welcome him to the ministry, even though he stumbled over the *Homo-ousion*. Similarly with regard to *Satisfactio*, the term has, in so many minds, associations with an unethical view of the Atonement, and an un-Christian idea of God, that I can sympathize with one who, heartily accepting the doctrine of a redemptive deed, a "finished work," on the Cross, should yet regard the phrase "satisfied Divine justice" as an insufficient one, coming far short of the New Testament interpretation of the Atonement. I, for one, would certainly not refuse a candidate because of any such reluctance; and, I feel sure, the examining body would take the same stand.

Father Kelly asks whether the phrase "this faith" in Art. XV means "the faith stated in the articles in general," and remarks that "the Article itself contains no definition of faith in Jesus Christ" (p. 438). I conceive that the word "faith" is used in this Article in accordance with the definition or description of faith given in Art. X.

There was, I am sure, no intention of unchurching any community of professed Christians who are trustfully committing themselves to Jesus Christ for salvation, and are seeking to obey Him as Lord.

"Faith" is taken in the Reformation sense of *fiducia*. Such "faith" may exist along with difficulties as to *Ousia*

and *Satisfactio*. It cannot exist along with rejection of the Divinity and the Atoning work of Christ.

It is on such lines as these that the examination of a candidate would proceed. In the light of such considerations the relation of the communion, holding this expression of the Christian faith, to others, whose expressions are different in form, would be regulated. The document is not a legal code; and it was not framed so as to be used after forensic analogies. It is the Confession of a Faith, wrought, as those who composed it believe, by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men, who, in their deep need, cast themselves upon the mercy of God in Christ Jesus.

Father Kelly finds one grave defect in the statement regarding the Person of the Redeemer. Does it, he asks, leave open the question of the "unity of Person" (p. 439)? The strictness of the Chalcedonian formula is certainly not reproduced in Art. VII, which is impassioned, rather than technical, in its style. Yet it seems to me plain that every assertion in it is made of the one only Person, the Eternal Son of God. He became truly man, and, in His true manhood, wrought out for us the redeeming purpose of God. He is the enthroned Lord, and carries on in the heavenlies His high priestly work on our behalf. He also dwells in our hearts by faith; and is present in His Church as its Head and King. There is no reference to Nestorianism. But it is certainly excluded by the whole tenor of the Article, which is an enthusiastic and even vehement assertion of the Unity of His Person, who is both Son of God, and Son of Man.

THE CHURCH.

It is under this head that the greatest difficulty lies in the way of mutual nnderstanding, between a man in Father Kelly's position, and those who occupy the posi-

tion indicated in the document under consideration. It is possible that differences of statement may conceal underlying unities. It is possible, also, that similarities of phraseology may disguise essential differences. An illustration may be found in the term "Catholic," which Father Kelly appropriates for the exclusive use of the "theological group" (p. 436) to which he himself belongs. A remark of the Dean of Durham is apposite, and, in the light of Father Kelly's usage, almost amusing. He says (*The Faith and the War*, p. 252 f.):

"Before any effective steps can be taken toward a reconciliation of the Churches, the famous terms 'Protestant' and 'Catholic' must be purged of many exasperating associations, and brought back to their essential and irreducible significance. . . . Assuredly there are many Catholic Protestants, and many Protestant Catholics." I am quite sure that the authors of the document regard themselves as being, in their "theological group," at once Catholic and Protestant. I wonder if Father Kelly is not a Protestant Catholic! I am sure he is profoundly Christian.

Father Kelly puts three questions, and desires to have them answered from the point of view of the document. Perhaps it will be better not to attempt detailed answers, but to indicate what seem to be the salient points. In this way, the answers may suggest themselves.

1. *The Nature of the Church.* The essence of the Church is defined by the New Testament word "fellowship" (κοινωνία). The Church consists of those who "have communion with their Lord and with one another." Fellowship with Jesus, the unseen but present Lord—that is the Divine side of the Church's being. Fellowship of believers with one another—that is the human side. The one cannot be separated from the other, under ordinary conditions. He who is united to Christ is united to his brethren. If he refuse their fellowship, he endangers his relation to his Lord. Membership in the fellowship

is not "a matter of indifference." If not essential to salvation, it is indispensable, as the condition of loyal service, and vigorous growth in grace. Further, the fellowship of believers was constituted in the days of our Lord's life in the flesh. He, the Master, was the bond of union, and all the disciples were brethren. It was reconstituted at Pentecost. He, the living Lord, dwells within the fellowship, its vital bond of union. It exists in Him and through Him. It is no dream of the future. It is a fact of the order of spiritual realities. I would ask Father Kelly to refresh his memory of "symbolics," so far as to read Art. XVI of the "*Confessio Fidei* and *Doctrinae per Ecclesiam Reformatam Regni Scotiae professae*" (1560). He will there find a passionate, almost hymnic, description of the Catholic Church, the Church which is the theme of the Epistle to the Ephesians, with a vigorous repudiation of sectarianism and individualism. This Church Catholic is "a Body already founded and constituted by Christ." At the same time, this ideal-real Church is a Divine purpose, to be served, and carried out by every believing man, till it fills the whole earth, and brings the nations to the obedience of faith.

2. *Order and Organization within the Church.* The Church is an ideal reality. But this does not mean that it exists in cloudland. It becomes visible in the actual fellowship of living men and women. Wherever, in a definite space, men and women are associated in fellowship with their Lord and with one another, there is the Church, the Body of Christ. Dr. Lindsay quotes the striking word of Ignatius, "Where Jesus Christ is, there is the *whole* Church" (See *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p. 14 f.). Every such fellowship lives, because Christ lives in it. This implies His absolute Lordship over it. Christian men are *not* "free to follow any order, or to organize themselves in any way which seems good to them." Here, however, is one of the instances, where words may be used to disguise dif-

ferences. I imagine Father Kelly to mean that Our Lord, or, it may be, His Apostles, instituted an order and organization clearly defined, and unalterable in any succeeding age; that, therefore, it is the duty of the Church in every age exactly to reproduce that order and organization; and that those who do not conform to the type of order and organization which Father Kelly believes to be laid down by Apostolic decree are "non-conformists," in the Anglican sense of the term, and outside the limits of the Catholic Church. If I am wrong in thus reading between the lines of his paper, I sincerely ask his pardon. In any case, it is not the belief of those who drew up the document, that our Lord, or His Apostles, imposed upon the Church any one type of outward order and organization, conformity to which would be a perpetual "note" of the true Church. They believe profoundly in the abiding presence of Christ in His Church, and His supremacy over it, and they bind themselves by the very fact of their faith in Him not wittingly to permit anything in His Church, which is not by His will and for His glory. For the discovery of that Will of Christ, they turn to the Sacred Scriptures, and wait for the interpretations of the Spirit, and the unfoldings of history. I know no words more adequate to express their point of view than those with which Dr. Hort closes his book on the *Christian Ecclesia:* "In this as in so many other things is seen the futility of endeavouring to make the Apostles' history into a set of authoritative precedents, to be rigorously copied without regard to time or place, thus turning the Gospel into a second Levitical Code. The Apostolic age is full of embodiments of purposes and principles of the most instructive kind: but the responsibility of choosing the means was left for ever to the Ecclesia itself, and to each Ecclesia, guided by ancient precedent on the one hand and adaptation to present and future needs on the other. The lesson-book of the Ecclesia, and of every Ecclesia, is not a law, but a history."

3. *The Unity of the Church.* Here, also, I suspect a difference of standpoint, covered by the use of similar words. By unity, I would gather from Father Kelly's questions and comments, he means external universality.

It is certain "that such a conception" did not lie within the minds of those who composed the document. The unity of which they are thinking is essentially spiritual. Personal union to Christ carries with it union with the whole body of the redeemed. "The unity of the Church," says Dr. Lindsay (op. cit. p. 14), "is a primary verity of the Christian faith. 'There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all' (Ephes. 4:4–6). And because the Unity of the Church of Christ is a primary verity of the Christian faith, it can never be adequately represented in any outward polity, but must always be, in the first instance at least, a religious experience. Its source and centre can never be an earthly throne, but must always be that heavenly place where Jesus sits at the right hand of God."

This oneness of the Church becomes manifest in time and space in three ways: (a) By the brotherly relations of *all* believers in Jesus, wheresoever they may dwell; (b) by the fellowship of the members of each community of believers; (c) by the relation of each "particular church" to every other throughout the world. It is conceivable that it would be well for all "particular churches" to be confederated in a union which would be worldwide. But such confederation would only be an application of the real unity, which is a primary verity of the faith. It would not be identical with that unity, in such a sense that a "particular church," which was not formally federated with the others, would *ipso facto* cease to be a "church" in the New Testament sense of the term. The forms, which shall express the relations of particular churches to one another, belong to the concerns, with

respect to which we seek the direction of the Head of the Church in His guidance of it through the centuries.

At this point emerges the question raised by Father Kelly: Does "particular Church" mean "local Church," or does the term mean "denomination?" I understand his own position to be this: "Catholic" means external universality; hence "catholic unity" permits of "local churches," but not of "denominations." A "denomination" is not entitled to the great name of "Church." "Denominations" may be composed of very worthy persons. But they are not "churches," and their members are not members of the Church of Christ. Such persons, unintentionally of course, are living in disobedience to Christ and are deprived of the benefits, sacramental and other, of the Church of Christ. Now, it seems to me that Father Kelly is altogether right, from his own standpoint, in saying (p. 444), "So far as we recognize denominational Churches, so far Catholic unity can only be a phrase." If catholicity be interpreted as the quality of one rigidly determined external order and organization, then, plainly, all bodies which do not adhere to that order and organization cannot be churches. But if the unity of the Church be not interpreted externally, but in the manner which I have indicated above—helping myself by quotations from Dr. Lindsay, then these baleful issues do not follow.

Dr. Lindsay's words, in the book referred to (pp. viii, ix), are so relevant that I crave leave to insert them here, making them the confession of my own belief, as I think they do express the mind of the authors of the document: "I devoutly believe that there is a Visible Catholic Church of Christ, consisting of all those throughout the world who visibly worship the same God and Father, profess their faith in the same Saviour, and are taught by the same Holy Spirit; but I do not see any Scriptural or even primitive warrant for insisting that catholicity *must* find visible expression in a uniformity of organization, of

ritual of worship, or even of formulated creed. This visible Church Catholic of Christ has had a life in the world historically continuous; but the ground of this historical continuity does not necessarily exist in any one method of selecting and setting apart office-bearers who rule in the Church; its basis is the real succession of the generations of faithful followers of their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ."—Dr. Lindsay adds with deep and sincere emotion: "It is with devout thankfulness that I can make this assumption with perfect honesty of heart and of head, because it relieves me from the necessity—sad, stern, and even hateful it must seem to many pious souls who feel themselves under its power—of unchurching and of excluding from the 'covenanted' mercies of God, all who do not accept that form of Church government which, to my mind, is truest to Scriptural principles and most akin to the ecclesiastical organization of the early centuries." The document, accordingly, regards those associations of Christian communities on the lines of some special order and organizations, which are commonly called "denominations," to be really "Churches," i.e. "particular churches," and holds them to be parts, more or less pure, of the universal brotherhood of Christians. From the point of view of the document, these various "denominations," Roman, Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and so forth, ought to bear themselves toward one another, as those who belong to the same great Church, the Church Catholic of Christ, not unchurching one another, but seeking to do one another good by building up each other's faith.

How far the incorporating union of denominations should proceed must be determined by considerations belonging to the particular territory concerned. The general principle must be that separation should cease, unless separation is held by any of the denominations concerned to be essential to the maintenance of some vital element in the Christian salvation. In Canada,

the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist communions have registered, in this document, their conviction that they are at one on the essentials of salvation. There is no doctrinal justification for separation. Whether the practical difficulties in the way of the incorporating union are insuperable, is still under discussion. Meantime, all parties, even those most opposed to union, are agreed that the three denominations are sister churches, and ought to, and may, work together in one harmonious endeavour to win Canada for Christ.

THE SACRAMENTS.

Father Kelly makes a remark which, I think, goes far. The statements which he examines show, he says, "that there is an agreement up to a point, unsuspected on either side" (p. 449). It is the tragedy of Church History that the Sacraments, and especially the Eucharist, which were designed as bonds of union, have become occasions of heart-breaking divisions. It surely gives real grief to a devout Christian like Father Kelly that he could not allow a Presbyterian minister to receive the Holy Communion in any church of which he had charge, far less to celebrate the Sacred Rite. In this exclusion of fellow-believers, I feel sure, he suffers even more pain than they do.

I have sought in vain to find, in his comments, any cause for the separation, as far as views on the nature of a Sacrament are concerned.

The position of the document is precisely that of the chief Reformation symbols. That Holy Thing which is represented, sealed, and applied to believers in both Sacraments is Christ Himself, in the fullness of His Humanity and Divinity, with all His saving functions and benefits. The only difference between them is that in the one He is viewed and received as the Initiator of the new life in salvation, while in the other, there is reception of Him as the gracious Maintainer and Increaser of the

life of the believer. I do not think that human speech could express adequately the solemn sense of the Presence of the Lord in the celebration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in a Presbyterian Church, as I have known it many times. No doctrinal statement I have ever seen, certainly not the theory of transubstantiation, rises to the fullness of conviction, with which the Churches of the Reformation hold, that the believing reception of the Sacred Elements is, at the same time, the reception of the once crucified and now Living Lord. An article in the *Times* for Jan. 27, 1917 has this striking passage: "There are many ways of celebrating the Holy Communion; serious as such differences may be, on the eve of battle the soldier knows that the Romans, the Anglicans, and the Non-conformists are remembering the same Great Act, and are communing, however dimly, with the same Lord. . . . If it were within the power of any recorder to compare spiritual experiences, it might be discovered that those who are keeping the solemn Feast according to all customs are nearer together than they think." It is this doctrine and experience of the Real Presence, which differentiates the Sacraments as means of grace from the rosary or the crucifix. These things may have their value—and I, for one, will not judge those, the praxis of whose devotions differs from my own. But they were not designed, and they are not fitted, to convey the Unspeakable Gift, which, in the Holy Communion, is bestowed upon, and communicated to, believers. The point of view I have indicated serves to explain most of the details to which Father Kelly alludes. I am sure the authors of the document will acknowledge fault in not having made plain that adults, who have not been baptized, are to be baptized, before being admitted to the further privilege of Holy Communion. The practice of infant baptism is grounded on the organic constitution of the Christian home. The children of such homes are born into the Christian fellowship, and are, therefore, to be baptized,

the full benefits of the sacrament accruing to them, when, as their growing spiritual capacity, with the aid of the Divine Spirit, enables them, they enact faith toward the Lord Jesus as their own Saviour.

MINISTRY.

What has been said above upon the Church serves to explain the view of the ministry, taken by the three sister churches.

To the "particular Church," smaller or greater, belongs sacerdotal power. The "priesthood of believers" is the presupposition of the document. There is no room in the Christian Fellowship for a mediating priesthood. From this point of view, the question of "orders," which, I understand, is the main cause of difference between the Roman and Anglican communions, subsides as meaningless. But this does not, according to the convictions of the Reformation Churches, imply a condition of anarchy. It is the Lord's will that there shall be order in His Church, and not disorder. Hence He has instituted a ministry, whose function it is to care for the spiritual life of the brotherhood, employing mainly the instrumentality of the Word and of the Sacraments.

The men who are to occupy this ministry are His gifts to His Church. Their authority comes to them from above, from the Living Lord Himself. When He has made plain who they are, whom He designates for this high calling, the Church receives them, and ordains them. The ways by which the Fellowship recognizes those whom the Lord has chosen will vary among the "particular churches." And it is not to be denied, but rather to be insisted on, that in this matter, as in all that concerns the spiritual life, the condition of apprehension, and the organ of discernment, is the believing heart, and the spiritual mind. There can be no "gift" appreciable by the unbelieving heart and the carnal mind. There

are other services in the Church than those whose chief concern is the Word and the Sacraments. The place which those who render such services shall hold in the Church, and the nature of the duties assigned them, may vary without creating any real difficulty or confusion. It is fitting that certain of these should be formally designated and set apart, as, e.g., Deaconnesses are in the Presbyterian Church; but ordination is viewed in the document as belonging to the ministry of the word.

I close, as I began, with a hearty acknowledgment of the graciousness of Father Kelly's comments. I trust I have been able to express the sincerity with which I have sought to respond to his Christian charity. If, unhappily, he and I cannot approach the same visible altar, I am convinced that our faith and love are one.

The Reality and Limitations of the Authority of the Church in Relation to the Gift of the Holy Spirit

By H. L. Goudge, M.A., D.D.,
Principal of Ely Theological College and Canon of Ely.

It may seem at first sight a somewhat abstract subject which has been chosen for this paper, but it is one nevertheless of great practical importance. It is the glory of Christianity, that it is at once the religion of authority and the religion of freedom. On the one hand, God offers to inform our minds and rule our wills by the gift of His Holy Spirit; on the other, the faith and the obedience which He desires are those which are freely rendered to Him. Though "power belongeth unto God,"[1] force does not. God sent His Son, as the Epistle to Diognetus says, *ὡς πείθων, οὐ βιαζόμενος. βία γὰρ οὐ πρόσεστι τῷ θεῷ.*[2] Moreover, in another sense Christianity is the religion of freedom. In yielding ourselves to God's easy yoke, we find ourselves set free from all that enslaves us, and hinders our full development. But the teaching and rule of God need to be known, in order to be appreciated; we are all at first disposed to prefer, either to remain "our own masters," or to submit ourselves to other men, whose claims seem less exacting than those of our true King. Thus to-day we find ourselves face to face with two opposite tendencies, of which the one leads to the re-

[1] Ps. LXII. 11.

[2] Ep. ad Diogn. VII. 4.

pudiation of authority without the attainment of any real freedom, and the other to the abandonment of freedom without the attainment of any satisfying authority. By a great many all claims to authority over thought or action are strongly resented; they object, not merely to an authority which attempts to override reason and conscience, but to authority of every kind; and the consequence is that they remain the slaves of their own prejudices and chance desires. By a few, on the other hand, the desire for authoritative guidance is felt to justify submission to whatever voice most confidently offers it, and so leads to the acceptance of a direction, which may be little wiser than their own. What we need, it must ever be remembered, is not just to be guided, but to be guided aright; and, in the deep things of life, we have no security that we are being guided aright, unless, directly or indirectly, it is God Who is guiding us. Does then the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church enable us to find there the guidance which we require, and, if so, how far does this guidance go? Caution is obviously necessary, since the Church is certainly human, though it may be also divine. Loyalty to God lays upon us the duty, not only of accepting the guidance which is really His, but also of cautious dealing with that which is not. "Ye were bought with a price; become not bond-servants of men." [3]

I.

What, let us first ask, do we mean by authority, and how does it appear in the Church? Much confusion arises from the fact, that the word "authority" is used in two distinct senses, when we speak of authority over the mind, and when we speak of authority over the will. Sometimes, no doubt, both forms of authority are rightly exercised by the same person; the parent is to the child

[3] I Cor. VII. 23.

both the guide to truth and the guide to action. But sometimes the two are separated. Our rulers in the State have authority over our action in many ways, but no authority over our thought, while our scholars exercise a real authority over our thought, but make no claim to direct our action. Now authority in both senses has a place in the Church, and would have it, even though the Church were nothing more than a human society. Authority over action must to some extent be exercised by the officers of all societies, if the purposes of those societies are to be attained, and the Church provides no exception to this rule. In the Church, again, as everywhere else, the less informed must put themselves to school with the better informed; unless we are willing, in the first instance, to accept truth on the authority of others, we are not likely to become competent to form opinions of our own. But neither the authority of the official, nor the authority of the expert, is what we have in view when we speak of the spiritual authority of the Church. The whole spiritual authority of the Church rests upon the fact that it is in the divine purpose the Body of Christ and the home of His Spirit, and so the medium, by which the authority of God Himself is brought to bear upon the minds and wills of men. "He that receiveth you receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me."[4] In this case, the distinction between authority over the mind and authority over the will tends to disappear. The commandments of God generally rest upon a revelation of truth, and the revelation of truth always calls for practical action. To God, and to the Church speaking in His Name, we must respond, neither by obedience only, nor by faith only, but by that living union of the two, which St. Paul calls "obedience of faith."[5] But here complication arises. When the presence of the Spirit is manifest in the Church, it transforms the character both of the official and of the

[4] Mt. X. 40. [5] Rom. I. 5.

expert authority, which are found independently of it. We may, *e.g.*, render enthusiastic obedience to our Bishop, not only because he is our Bishop, but because he is so spiritual a man, that we recognize in his direction the direction of God Himself; or, again, we may trust the guidance of our scholars, not merely because of their human learning, but because we recognize in them a spiritual insight, which proceeds from a far higher source. But, none the less, if we would avoid serious confusion of thought, we must carefully distinguish spiritual both from official and from expert authority. Such confusion easily arises, since the word "spiritual" is occasionally used in the sense of "clerical" or "ecclesiastical," as when we speak of the lords spiritual, or of spiritual courts. The instructions and the commands of ecclesiastical persons may approve themselves as those of the Spirit of God; if so, we are bound to accept them. But they may unhappily not thus approve themselves, and then our relation to them is very different. The instructions depend for any value they may possess upon the knowledge which lies behind them, and the commands should be obeyed only if the official who issues them has the right to do so. In this paper we shall not be concerned with official or expert authority, either to affirm its reality or to point out its limitations; we shall be concerned with spiritual authority and with that alone.

II.

What then is divine, or spiritual, authority? We shall consider it first, as we find it exercised in its perfection by the Lord Jesus Christ in the days of His earthly life. There are two reasons why we should first consider it as we find it in Him. On the one hand, we shall here find it at its maximum. "Never man so spake." [6] If we can recognize the spiritual authority of the Lord's

[6] Jn. VII. 46.

words, as we read them to-day in the pages of a book, what must have been their power, when they were spoken by His lips? The Church, for reasons to be presently considered, can never exercise spiritual authority as the Lord exercised it. But, even were the Church all that it ought to be, "the disciple is not above his master";[7] the authority of the Church cannot rise above that of the Lord, or be free from the limitations to which His was subject. On the other hand, in the Lord we see spiritual authority in its purity; it is not confused, or blended, with the authority conferred by office or by human learning. Official authority our Lord had none, except in so far as the Apostles may have come to recognize His Messianic position. He was neither a secular ruler, nor a Levitical priest, nor even a scribe officially recognized. The authority conferred by human learning was equally absent. Whatever mystery may involve the question of our Lord's human knowledge, this at any rate is clear. If our Lord possessed stores of human learning beyond the reach of His contemporaries, He did not reveal their existence, or base His authority upon them. The Christ of the Apocryphal Gospels may claim to be an encyclopaedia of infallible information on all subjects, but the Christ of the Canonical Gospels makes no such claim. Thus, in considering spiritual authority, as we find it in the Lord, we shall be in little danger of confusing it with anything else. What then was its source? What was its range? Over whom was it exercised?

Firstly, what was its source? It is characteristic of the Lord to insist continually upon His dependence. "I am come down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me." [8] Just as He has no plans of His own, so He has no message of His own. "The seed is the word of God." [9] "The word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's, Who sent Me." [10] But this dependence, so far from depriving Him of authority, is

[7] Luk. VI. 40. [8] Jn. VI. 38. [9] Luk. VIII. 11. [10] Jn. XIV. 24.

precisely that which gives to Him His authority. When the Lord says "Follow Me," without giving any reason why He should be followed, or when He says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you," without giving any reason why He should be believed, it is surely His conscious relation to the Father, which lies behind His words. Just as the Father has given "to the Son to have life in Himself,"[11] so He has given to the Son to have authority in Himself. The reason why the Lord says "I say unto you," while the prophets say, "Thus saith the Lord," is not that the Lord's word has an authority independent of the Father's, but that it is so absolutely one with the Father's, that a distinction between them is inconceivable. The Father, in "delivering all things" [12] to the Son, has not Himself lost them, nor has the Son any authority which He can use apart from the Father's will. Rather, the Son is the medium, though the willing conscious medium, through which the authority of the Father reaches the world, and the claims are made upon mind and will which only God can rightly make. The importance of this will presently appear. Official authority may be misused, but not spiritual authority. It is only, in so far as he who exercises it is the willing instrument of God, that spiritual authority can exist at all.

Secondly, what was the range of the spiritual authority, which we see in the Lord? It was exercised over the mind and over the will, but the proclamation of truth came first, and the direction of conduct second. Our Lord came forth to proclaim a gospel, and the authority, with which He spoke, gave to that gospel its convincing power. Men recognized the truth of the Lord's proclamation, and the duty of believing it. Thus far the authority of the Lord was over the mind. But the acceptance of the Lord's gospel involved the living of the life, which corresponded to it. If "the kingdom of God" was at

[11] Jn. V. 26. [12] Mt. XI. 27.

hand, men must "repent" [13] in order to be ready for it. Moreover, the acceptance of the Lord's message involved a new relation to Him. The Lord claimed to direct the action of His followers, not only by the general moral principles which He laid down, but by particular commands given to individuals. If He called them to leave father, and mother, and all that they had, they had no right to refuse His call.[14] Moreover, this exercise of authority, like that involved in the proclamation of the gospel, carried with it its own justification. Though it was possible to refuse submission, it was not possible to feel justified in refusing it; the young man who had great possessions "went away sorrowful."[15] Indeed, we can hardly fail to notice that the spiritual authority, which the Lord exercised, had a practical even more than a theoretical bearing. The Lord had indeed a definite message, which He had come to deliver, a message to be accepted in its entirety. But the message was limited in its range; it was expressed largely in the bold symbolic language of the prophets, and in the forms of thought of the Lord's own day; it did not lend itself easily to translation into the language of scientific theology. The Lord spoke in parables, and, if He was pressed for further information, refused it, or said that He had it not to give.[16] And, though this might in part be due to limitations which would pass away,[17] it was due in part also to the strictly practical character of the Lord's mission. It was practical obedience, upon which He chiefly insisted, and practical obedience, to which He recalled His followers, when they showed a preference for theological information. Seldom surely has there been a teacher more disappointing to our curiosity. All this we shall have to remember at a later stage. Spiritual authority differs greatly from that of the scientific expert. It is far more practical in its demands, and much less intellectually informing.

[13] Mk. I. 15. [14] *Cf.* Luk. XIV. 33. [15] Mt. XIX. 22.
[16] *Cf.* Luk. XIII. 23, 24; Mk. XIII. 4, 32. [17] Jn. XVI. 25.

Thirdly, over whom was this authority exercised? The spiritual authority of the Lord was never an authority which compelled ordinary men to bow to it. The Lord drew men after Him, but never dragged them. He did not "strive, nor cry aloud";[18] He made no attempt to beat down opposition, or to overawe His hearers; nor did He impose any immediate punishment upon the unbelieving or disobedient. His appeal was to the minds and consciences of His hearers,[19] and if He failed to win them by His own method, He refused to employ any other. Indeed, not only did the Lord never force men to come to Him; He did not even force them to stay with Him, if they wished to leave Him, after they had come. "Would ye also go away?" They might go, if they would. If they stayed, it was because they recognized on the lips of the Lord "the words of eternal life."[20] Thus, though the range of the Lord's authority was *de jure* universal, *de facto* it only extended as far as men were capable of hearing His Voice, and ready to respond to it. To this the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels bear a consentient witness. "Every one that is of the truth heareth My Voice."[21] "He that is of God heareth the words of God: for this cause ye hear them not, because ye are not of God."[22] "If any man willeth to do" God's "will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from Myself."[23] So we read in the Fourth Gospel. But the Synoptic record is no less clear. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."[24] "The lamp of the body is the eye; if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness."[25] The last passage is especially significant. It shows that the reason for spiritual blindness is not any predestination, for which men are not answerable, but

[18] Mt. XII. 19, quoting Is. XLII. 2. [19] Luk. XII. 57.
[20] Jn. VI.67, 68. [21] Jn. XVIII. 37. [22] Jn. VIII. 47. [23] Jn. VII. 17.
[24] Luk. VIII. 8. [25] Mt. VI. 22, 23.

those sins, which make the heart hard, and that lack of desire for goodness, which deprives the divine message of its power to appeal to us. The characteristic of spiritual authority is not that it gives to its possessor the right to compel obedience to it, but that obedience to it cannot be compelled.

III.

We see then the characteristics of spiritual authority, as we find them in the Lord. It is an authority which rests upon the divine indwelling; it is given for the delivery and practical application of a divine message; and it is authority only for those prepared to recognize it. What we have now to see is that the spiritual authority of the Church has exactly the same characteristics; it is in fact our Lord's own authority, living on in the Church, to which His presence is promised till the end of the world. Were the Church entirely faithful, its authority would be all that the Lord's was; but it could not be more than His, nor effect what His did not effect. Thus to understand the authority of the Church is not only to understand its reality; it is to understand also its limitations; and if the world fails to recognize the former, Catholic Christians often fail to recognize the latter. We shall try, under the guidance of the New Testament, to make both sides of the truth as clear as we may.

But at this point a difficulty will be felt. Before we discuss the authority of the Church, must we not define the boundaries of the Church? Some would include within it far more of Christendom than others. Moreover, even when we have to our own satisfaction defined these boundaries, further questions arise. Who, and under what conditions, have the right to speak for the Church, and to exercise its authority? It is in this way that the Catholic theologian might ask us to proceed, and, were official authority in question, he might do so rightly. But spiritual authority is a different thing, and

depends for its existence upon different conditions. Define the Church and its constitution as we will, two facts are undeniable. That part of Christendom, which we include within the Church, contains a multitude, who are not yet effectively the organs of the Spirit of God, and that part of Christendom, which we exclude from the Church, contains a multitude, in whom the presence of that Spirit is manifest. If then, as we shall see to be the case, the spiritual authority of the Church depends upon the actual operation of the Spirit of God, it follows that spiritual authority neither belongs in its fullness to that part of Christendom which we include within the Church, nor is it altogether absent from that part which we exclude. The divine intention is one thing, and its actual fulfilment is another. The divine intention, we know, is that the Church should be visibly one, that no lover of the light should be living in separation from it, and that every member should in his own place and measure be filled with the Spirit of God. All alike should be "taught of God";[26] all alike should, as they come to maturity, "know all things"[27] which belong to the gospel of Christ; all alike should be "full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another."[28] In such a Church, there would be no question as to who had the right to speak for it. The special organs for its varied activities would be provided by the Lord Himself,[29] and recognized by the whole body; but spiritual authority would belong to the whole, and the divine message preached to the world would have behind it, not merely the power of the Spirit in the preacher, but the corporate witness in act as well as in word of the whole people of God. "All the body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in

[26] Jn. VI. 45.
[27] Jn. II. 20.
[28] Rom. XV. 14.
[29] *Cf.* I Cor. XII. 4–11; Eph. IV. 7–12.

love." [30] But who does not see that this is an ideal picture, and that, if we argue as if it were realized in the Church as we define it, we shall indeed go far astray? Though ideally the Church is the Body of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Spirit, no actual community of Christians realizes that ideal. Spiritual authority is a question of degree, and, while a body of Christians, whose ecclesiastical position is irreproachable, may possess very little of it, a body of Christians, whose position is most irregular, may possess a great deal. But, less or more, the characteristics of this authority are invariable, and it is these which we are seeking to understand.

We turn then to the witness of the New Testament, to verify, or correct, in the case of the Church the conclusions to which we have been led by our consideration of the authority of the Lord. And since the spiritual authority of the Church rests upon the gift of the Holy Spirit, we shall pay particular attention to those chapters of the Fourth Gospel, in which our Lord speaks of that gift. The view that we may adopt of the Fourth Gospel will not greatly matter for our purpose. We may regard these chapters as giving us the actual words of the Lord, or as giving us our Lord's teaching in the words of the Evangelist, or even as freely composed by the Evangelist himself. In any case, it is plain from the whole New Testament record that the Spirit actually did for the Apostles what the Lord's words here assert that He will do. What then is the character of the Church's spiritual authority, as these chapters describe it to us?

In the first place, like the spiritual authority of the Lord, it depends entirely upon the maintenance of a personal relation to God. Everything depends upon the coming and indwelling of the Spirit,[31] upon the Lord's coming through the Spirit,[32] upon the coming of the Father and the Son through the Spirit,[33] and it is clear throughout that the divine indwelling is conditioned by moral faith-

[30] Eph. IV. 16. [31] Jn. XIV. 16. [32] Jn. XIV. 18. [33] Jn. XIV. 23.

fulness,—by our loving the Lord and keeping His word.[34] Now it is surely impossible to insist too strongly upon this condition. Even the authority of the Lord Himself was, it would seem, dependent upon His continual self-surrender to the Father.[35] But, since in the Lord's case the condition was always fulfilled, it is not necessary to insist upon it. With the Church the case is far otherwise, and to regard its spiritual authority as an inalienable endowment is an error of the most serious kind. "If ye love Me, ye will keep My commandments, and I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth: Whom the world cannot receive, for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him." [36] Most rightly do we apply these words to the indwelling of the Spirit in the Church till the end of time. "The promise," as St. Peter says, is to us and to our "children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him." [37] But we cannot disregard the condition which the Lord lays down. "The world cannot receive" the Holy Spirit; and, if that be so, the Church, in so far as it comes to resemble the world, cannot receive Him, or retain Him when received. Though we are not straitened in God, we are straitened in our own affections, and unless, individually and corporately, we love our Lord and keep His commandments, our Lord will not pray for the Spirit to be given to us, nor can He in fact be given. What then are we to make of a conception of the Church, according to which it is just as much "the pillar and ground of the truth," [38] and has just the same claim to guide our faith and direct our practice, whatever its moral condition may be? The Church, define it as we will, is not yet "a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing"; [39] it consists of a multitude

[34] Jn. XIV. 15, 21, 23; XV. 10.
[35] *Cf.* Jn. VIII. 29.
[36] Jn. XIV. 15–17.
[37] Ac. II. 39.
[38] I. Tim. III. 15.
[39] Eph. V. 27.

of professing Christians with all their unrepented sin and refusals of the divine grace. Though the Holy Spirit is its appointed guide, and strives to fulfil His mission to it, the result of His action is necessarily dependent upon the response which the Church makes. We may hold any view we like as to where the authority of the Church resides. We may place it in the Pope, or in the Catholic Episcopate, or in Oecumenical Councils, or in the so-called Undivided Church, or in the general judgment of the Church collectively, or in some combination of these; but the moment we maintain the existence of a spiritual authority, which, like official authority, can be independent of moral faithfulness, we come into conflict with our Lord's teaching. A spiritual authority, which resides equally in St. Gregory and in Alexander VI, equally in the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem and in the Council of Ephesus, is an authority in which our Lord forbids us to believe. "The argument," it has been well said, "that, because the Church is the upholder of the truth, therefore anything which the Church may at any time promulgate is true, is the same as if we should say that because the sovereign power is the proper fountain of justice, therefore everything which the sovereign power may do is just." To say that individuals may err, but not the Church, is to say what is meaningless, if we mean by the Church, not the Church as it exists in the divine idea, but the actual body of imperfect Christians, with which we in fact have to do. If the human will can hinder the operation of the Holy Spirit in the individual, it can do so in the community; we cannot hold one theory of grace in regard to Christians individually, and another in regard to Christians corporately. That the truth will never be altogether lost our Lord's words and our age-long experience may justify us in believing, but it does not follow from this that the Church, as we define it, can never teach what is false, or that its "living voice" is always to be accepted as the Voice of God. To accept

our Lord's teaching as to the gift of the Spirit is to recognize that the authority of the Church varies with the sanctity of the Church. And, if it be urged that such a view as this makes it impossible to say when the Church is to be believed and obeyed, and when it is not, the answer is easy. Spiritual authority has no need to be authenticated in advance, because it authenticates itself. The people of Jerusalem accepted the message of St. Peter, not because he had proved that he was infallible as the Vicar of Christ, but because they were "pricked in their heart" [40] by the Spirit Who spoke through him. The people of Corinth accepted St. Paul's message, not because he had already proved himself to be the ambassador of God, but because his message came to them "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." [41] So it is to-day. What is important is not the spiritual authority which we claim, but the spiritual authority which we are found actually to exercise. Official authority can be proved by documents, and expert authority by the testimony of other experts, but spiritual authority must prove itself. If it does not, nothing else can prove it.

From the source of the Church's spiritual authority we pass to consider its range. It has to do, like that of the Lord, both with thought and with action, but again as with the Lord, authority to declare the truth comes first, and authority to direct action second. The primary purpose of the gift of the Spirit, as our Lord speaks of it, is the apprehension and proclamation of the gospel. The Spirit will recall to the Apostles the message spoken by the Lord Himself,[42] and will complete the Lord's message by declaring unto them "the things" which, when the Lord spoke, were still "to come." [43] He will, that is to say, reveal the meaning of the great series of redemptive acts, which was to begin with the Lord's death, and end with the coming of the Spirit Himself. In both ways

[40] Ac. II. 37.
[41] I Cor. II. 4.
[42] Jn. XIV. 26. *Cf.* XVI. 25.
[43] Jn. XVI. 12, 13.

He will "glorify the Lord,"[44] and guide "into all the truth."[45] Then, having done all this, the Spirit through the Apostles will "bear witness to the world"[46] and "convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."[47] How entirely these anticipations were fulfilled, the New Testament sufficiently shows. As far as the great Christian gospel is concerned, the unanimity of the Apostles is most impressive. There is nothing tentative about their apprehension of it; the Spirit has given to them absolute assurance of the message they are sent to deliver, and enables them to deliver it with convincing power. Moreover, when the message has been accepted, the Spirit in the Church, like the Lord in His earthly life, guides to action as well as to truth. His authority is exercised, not merely in the fuller explication of the gospel, but in insisting upon the moral duties which follow upon its acceptance, and flow from the truths which it proclaims. Nor is the Spirit's authority over action confined to general precepts; through the Christian prophets He issues detailed instructions, as the Lord had done. "Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."[48] "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things."[49] "Having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia."[50] But this divine message, which the Church proclaimed with such spiritual authority, was a message limited in its range, even when it had received the fulfilment, which it could not have before the Lord was glorified. The "all things" which the Spirit was to teach, the "all the truth" into which He was to guide, was the truth contained in the Person, the word, and the work of the Lord, "in Whom," as St. Paul says, "are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden."[51] The promise that the Spirit will guide into

[44] Jn. XVI. 14. [45] Jn. XVI. 13. [46] Jn. XV. 26. [47] Jn. XVI. 8.
[48] Ac. XIII. 2. [49] Ac. XV. 28. [50] Ac. XVI. 6. *Cf.* VIII. 29.
[51] Col. II. 3.

all the truth is part of the same discourse as that in which our Lord declares Himself to be "the truth,"[52] and we must not extend its scope beyond the limits which the context so plainly gives to it. And this too it is necessary to press upon many Catholics to-day. Few may still attempt to extend the teaching authority of the Church beyond faith and morals; the lesson of Galileo's condemnation has at least been partially learned. But many appear to think that the Church has spiritual authority to declare the truth upon every question of religious belief and practice, and the Church possesses no such authority as this. The message of the gospel is indeed a message of far horizons. It includes the nature of God, and the calling and destiny of man. It provides for our deliverance from sin, and the realization of our glorious possibilities. Though not at first expressed in the language of a scientific theology, it is full of theological implications, which the Church in the conflict with error has more and more brought out into the light of day, and it suggests, no doubt, more than it distinctly reveals. But it does not tell us all that we should like to know. Outside "the truth as it is in Jesus" [53] the Apostles knew no more than we do; indeed they knew far less than we ought to know to-day. They were, *e.g.*, in error as to the time of the Lord's return, and altogether ignorant of much that is necessary for the right understanding of the Old Testament. Here too we see that the spiritual authority of the Church is of the same character as that of the Lord in His earthly life. Though entirely adequate for its practical purpose, it is not extended beyond.

Thirdly, with regard to the people, over whom this authority is exercised. Here too we see that the mind of the Apostles corresponds to the mind of the Lord. If for a moment after Pentecost St. Peter seems to anticipate a national conversion, it is but for a moment. The Apostles do not expect whole nations to yield to their

[52] Jn. XIV. 6. [53] Eph. IV. 21.

spiritual authority, nor do they feel themselves condemned, when they do not attain a success, which was never their Master's. Their task is to "gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad," [54] the sheep of Christ "ordained," or disposed, "to eternal life." [55] As to the rest—"For this cause the world knoweth us not, because it knew Him not." [56] "If our gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that are perishing; in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, Who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them." [57] It is this sense of the necessary limitation of spiritual authority, which explains the calmness and dignity of the Apostolic preaching. They speak with calm assurance of the truth of their message, as the Lord spoke; when they are met with malignant hostility, they speak sternly, as the Lord also did. But there is no attempt to overawe, or hypnotize, men into belief, and no juggling with emotion. The appeal, as with the Lord, is ever to reason and conscience, and, if that appeal is set aside, they shake the dust from their feet,[58] and go elsewhere. Everywhere their hearers are encouraged to exercise their own judgment as intelligent and responsible beings.[59] And if this be so, when Christian teachers appeal to the world, still more is it so when they appeal to those who already share the gift of the Spirit. "Quench not the Spirit; despise not prophesyings; but prove all things: hold fast that which is good." [60] "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God." [61] "Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others discriminate." [62] Spiritual authority is authority which reason and conscience recognize, not authority which sets either aside. The Spirit of God in the teacher appeals to the Spirit of God in the hearer,

[54] Jn. XI. 52. [55] Ac. XIII. 48. [56] I Jn. III. 1.
[57] 2 Cor. IV. 3, 4. [58] Ac. XIII. 5. [59] Ac. XVII. 11.
[60] I Thess. V. 19–21. [61] I Jn. IV. 1. [62] I Cor. XIV. 29.

and deep must answer unto deep. And if it be said that this is to make private judgment supreme, and to allow men to reject the divine word, because it does not appeal to them in their ignorance and sin, the answer is that the Lord allowed this, and so perforce must we. The message delivered in the power of the Spirit can do what the word of men cannot do, but it will not convert the world against the world's will. Once more, *βία οὐ πρόσεστι τῷ θεῷ*, and to wish that it were otherwise is to mistrust the ways of God.

IV.

We see then what the spiritual authority of the Church is, and is not. It is a divine authority, like that of the Lord. It rests upon the presence of the Spirit, and it exists in the Church as a whole, and in all the members of the Church, just in so far as the Spirit has been received, and is allowed free course. Its purpose is the delivery and application of a definite, though limited, message, and it is recognized by all who are "disposed to eternal life." Is this an authority so far less than what the Church has sometimes claimed, that those who accept the view here taken must feel themselves disillusioned and disappointed? That depends upon what we desire. It is indeed disappointing, if we desire short cuts to truth, and the comfort of certainty without the pain of obedience; it is indeed disappointing, if we cannot bear to seem to fail. But if we only desire what our Lord desires for us, it is a view to help and encourage us, and never more so, than under the difficulties, which we must face to-day. What has indeed brought wide disillusionment and disappointment is a false view of spiritual authority; perhaps a truer view may restore our confidence. Let us consider a few consequences, which flow from it.

Firstly, then, it shows us that, if we are lacking in spiritual authority, the remedy lies in our own hands.

One great source of our discouragement is that we fail to see this. Many loyal members, for example, of the Anglican communion seem strangely to suppose that there is something about their position, which renders the exercise of spiritual authority impossible. Now that the Roman Church exercises an authority over its members, which we do not exercise over ours, is undoubtedly true; it may even be true, though this is far less clear, that the Roman Church exercises a spiritual authority over its members, which we do not exercise over ours. But if it be so, the reason must be that the Roman Church loves Christ better, and better observes His commandments, and so has more of the Spirit of God. We shall not gain more of the Spirit of Truth by submission to claims, which seem to us to be baseless; as Charles Kingsley, in this connection, said,

"Caelum, non animam, mutant, qui trans mare currunt."

But we shall certainly gain more of the Spirit of Truth if we love our Lord better, and better observe His word. There is every reason to believe that the gift of the Spirit is able to bring us to visible unity, but no reason to believe that visible unity is itself able to bring to us the gift of the Spirit and the spiritual authority which depends upon it. Our Lord has told us the way to attain what we desire; we have only to follow it.

Secondly, though the true view limits the range of the Church's spiritual authority, the recognition of this limitation is altogether reassuring. The Church in the past has taught with insistence, though not with the authority of the Spirit, a great deal which has turned out to be false. The views of the universe, which the Church maintained upon the authority of Scripture, the views of the nature and character of much of Scripture itself, which the Church maintained upon the authority of the Jews of the first century, have alike passed away for ever. We fought for them gallantly, because we felt

the Church to be committed to them, and there is no disguising our defeat. But the Church was defeated upon ground which it had no commission to occupy. The truth, into which the Spirit was sent to guide us, has nothing to tell us about physical science, or about the composition and historical accuracy of the Old Testament; and a proper regard for authority in these subjects should have sent us, not to the Fathers of the Church, but to the men of science and the Semitic scholars. The value of the Vincentian rule—"quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus"— entirely depends upon the source of the Church's unanimity. If it is due to the teaching of the Spirit, we do right to bow to it; if it is due to other reasons, we must consider what those reasons are worth. So far from that view of the Old Testament, which the Church has in the past maintained, being taught by the Spirit of God, the Church has always found it most difficult to harmonize with His teaching. But has the Spirit ever failed to teach the lovers of Christ anything that Christ promised that He would teach them, or has He ever failed them in their proclamation of the gospel to the world? In spite of all the changes in our language and forms of thought, the great truths of the Divine Sonship and Mission of the Lord, of redemption by His Cross and Resurrection, of the gift of the Holy Ghost, of the divine rule in the present and the divine rule promised in the future, have been preserved and proclaimed with power all down the ages. What more is needed? Much every way in our response to God, but nothing whatever in His faithfulness with us.

Lastly, the true view will leave us undismayed, though the world as a whole may reject our message. If real conviction be ours through the teaching of the Spirit, the world's rejection will in no way deprive us of it. Certainly, we shall ask ourselves continually, how far the fault lies with us, that so few believe. We shall test our own message, by comparing it with that of the

Apostles, and pray for deeper personal conviction, and for more power to convince others. But we shall not expect a success, that our Lord has never promised us; nor shall we run feverishly from one method to another, because we have not attained it. The gospel is intended to be the touchstone of humanity, to divide men in anticipation of the divine judgment; when it does this, it does what the Lord intended it to do. Enough if we so speak, that the Lord's sheep hear His Voice; He Himself asks no more of us.

Christ the Revelation of God

By W. P. DuBose, M.A., S.T.D.

When we speak of Christ in absolute terms as the Revelation of God, in order positively to define what we mean we must of necessity begin with a process of delimitation, or even seeming contradiction. Not only cannot God Himself be wholly revealed to us, but actually there are many things in God's relation to ourselves, both in our constitution and in our condition, upon which He has made no immediate or direct revelation in Christ. There is nothing in our Science proper that is matter of divine revelation or that we are under obligation to take "on faith." As little is there anything of technical revelation in our Philosophy—or even in our Morality. All these are distinctively human tasks and accomplishments, upon which I will not say that our Lord has thrown no light from without or from above, but which He has in no wise lifted from the shoulders of humanity itself.

And the revelation to us in Christ would be less truly divine than it is, if it were, what to our foolish eyes might seem, *more* so—that is, if it relieved us of any whatsoever of our own human part in the fellowship of God and man. Indeed, to bring out and vindicate the true and real divinity of Christ, it becomes necessary to rid our minds of much of the spurious deity too popularly ascribed to Him.

It may seem to be going far towards extremes to say that the habitual and characteristic miracles of our Lord were distinctly and distinctively human acts: that is to say, they were the things that humanity should do and

could do and would do if it were raised to that fellowship with God which it attained in Christ. And as our Lord's works on earth were wrought in and by His humanity and were human works, so His knowledge upon earth was a human knowledge, a human knowledge whether of God, of man, or of things—a knowledge which we ourselves shall share, if in imperfection here, yet unto perfection as we are more and more conformed to His divine image and likeness.

How else are we to interpret our Lord's own teaching: "The works that the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me" (St. John 5:36). "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do." And, why? Because He is going to the Father, but will return to consummate in them all that He has accomplished and attained for them in Himself: the Incarnation in Christ is complete only in humanity. Are there not in every age indications and assertions, more or less irregular and futile, but always significant of what the life of faith, the life in Christ and of Christ, should be and might be if only we had faith? What stronger language could our Lord have employed to express and declare the possibilities of faith? I will anticipate now so far as to say, that the positive and definite revelation in Christ is sufficiently expressed in the primitive statement: *Totam expositionem hominis in se recapitulat.* Christ is the eternal divine Foreknowledge, Predestination, Process and Fulfilment of humanity. He is not merely the How but also the What of human evolution.

Jesus Christ had a spiritual as well as a physical human genealogy and descent: He was by faith as well as by blood the Son of Abraham and of David. However far He transcended it, He was in the direct line of human spiritual

evolution and progress. If Abraham was His precursor—with others before and after him—in that life in God through faith of which He was to be pre-eminently and finally "the Author and Finisher," so too David and the Prophets after him were already at work upon the Kingdom of God of which only He could be the ultimate Founder. Jesus was filled to overflowing with the piety of His ancestry, whose very language He appropriated while fulfilling their thoughts, realizing their hopes and embodying their aspirations and expectations.

There are two absolute correlatives that can in no wise exist apart: there is no true or real natural instinct, intimation, or intuition that has not its proper object or objective. And in such a case the object is as dependent upon the receptivity and potency of the instinct or intuition as the latter is upon the fact and satisfying reality of its object. The infant would have no instinct of the breast if there were no breast, but neither could the breast draw the infant if there were no infant impulse and impulsion to it. Any possible drawing of God to man must have its natural correlate in the drawing of man to God: there is no imparting where there is no receiving. Jesus Christ was just as much the coming of man to God as He was the coming of God to man, and He could have been neither without the other. He is absolutely the revelation to us, because the fulfilment for us and in us, of both; and whatever difficulty or confusion we find in doing so, we must know Him in unhesitating terms of both.

God is as much in creation and in nature as He is in Incarnation. The Word that was in the beginning with God and was One with Himself, by which He made the heaven and the earth and all that are in them, Which took flesh and dwelt among us, and Whose glory we beheld, as of the Only-Begotten of the Father—is all one Word. But He speaks in different tongues and addresses Himself to different organs of reception in the different

spheres which we distinguish as the natural and the spiritual. The function of Nature is the development or evolution of man's part in the life and work of the world. This consists in the right exercise and use of his own reason, the right disposition and ordering of his own affections, the right direction and employment of his own will or freedom. All these are concerned primarily with conditions and matters lying within his natural observation and experience. What he has to do with them is to make the most of them, and to make himself in doing so: in other words, to more and more realize or fulfil himself through the perfecting of his relation and correspondence with his nature and his environment. Revelation is out of place here; man is purposely thrown upon his own resources for the bringing out all *himself*. So I repeat that the intrusion or assertion of revelation in the legitimate spheres of science or philosophy or of what we call natural morality or ethics is an impertinence. God is in these things but His plan here is to work them out in, with, through and by the intelligence, affections and will of men: these are the means and methods of all distinctively *human* evolution.

So all that we know, or properly call by the name, of *Law* is outside of revelation, except in so far as we say that all nature too is in a lower sense a revelation of God. How we distinguish the higher or proper revelation will appear further on. Law lies wholly within the sphere of the lower revelation of nature; the higher revelation of Spirit does not abolish, but lifts it into something higher and infinitely more effective than itself. In its higher form and spirit law is, or becomes, identical with (simply the fact and expression of) holiness, righteousness, life. Below or outside of these it remains itself, and as such can no otherwise be either evaded and escaped or compromised with—law is simply and absolutely the demand for righteousness, and righteousness is no mere imposition or requirement of even eternal or divine authority: it is an

inexorable and irreducible *Fact.* "He that doeth" the thing that we call righteousness "shall live,"—because righteousness *is*, and is nothing else, and nothing else is, *life.* Because it is, and nothing else is, life, therefore it carries with it and in it *all there is* of worth or value, of peace or joy, of merit or reward, to be found in life. By natural necessity or logical consequence, "He that doeth it not shall die," for what is death but the negation of all that is life? All that is *of God* is so *in itself:* there is no question of "vindicating" either Him or it.

There is only one way then either of evading the necessity or of escaping the consequences of law—and that way lies neither below nor beside, but only above it: we must find it in something higher and stronger than law.

For what hope is there in mere law, in the mere fact that righteousness is life and unrighteousness is death, and that always and inevitably we shall find it so? That is a natural, not a revealed fact; is natural morality able to cope with it? For that matter, it may be replied, has revealed morality or religion been able to deal with it? Has it made the world, or any elect portion of it righteous? Has it produced the fruits of righteousness in the peace and joy of human life? This brings us to the attempt to state positively *What is* new or revealed and efficacious in Christianity. Taking it very gradually and step by step, it is not enough to say that Christ reveals God as Love, and love as the soul and life of righteousness. That in principle may be discovered in the devotional life and worship which our Lord inherited and to which He largely conformed—as for example when He says, "Thus it behoveth us to fulfil all righteousness." Our Lord was indeed the absolute revealer of Love, but we shall have to say a great deal more about love before we can say just How He was so.

Again, it is not enough to say that Jesus revealed God to us as Our Father. Did not St. Paul at Athens recognize and acknowledge the natural intuition and intimation

of that fact even among the Gentiles? Our Lord did indeed in the very highest sense, and in a way unknown before, reveal to us the Fatherhood of God; but it will require much to be said upon the nature and mode of the Fatherhood of God and the consequent sonship of man, before we can undertake to answer the question How He did so.

The point to keep constantly in mind is that Jesus Himself came to, arrived at, these truths or facts—God as Love and God as Father—humanly as well as divinely. The human way to God is—through faith, by obedience, and in sacrifice: there is no other approach for man to God. Even in these acts and processes which constitute what we call "man's part" in our life in God, it is God Who is drawing us to Him; but He draws us "with the cords of a man." That is to say, it is only through our own needs, wants and susceptibilities, in this case our spiritual instincts, intuitions and affections—in a word through the spiritual selves that He has made us—that God can draw or take us into Himself. Our part, whatever it is, is the necessary condition of any inclusion of *us* in any relation or co-operation with God. So when we say that love or fatherhood or any goodness whatever on God's part towards us is conditional or conditioned in any way, the condition is wholly and only in us and on our part and not with Him. He absolutely "would"—it is only whether "we will."

Our Lord said, "No man cometh to me except God the Father draw him." What is true of us was true of Him: God perfectly came to Him because in response to the drawing He perfectly came to God. He humanly took to Himself *all* the truth and fact that God is Love, God is Father, and God is Life eternal. He realized in Himself all that God "would be" in Him and through Him in all humanity. We shall see this more plainly if we dwell a moment upon the distinctly human drawings of our Lord to the Father through which the divine Sonship be-

came so completely incarnated in Him. No one can read understandingly the earthly life of Jesus without seeing how utterly it was a life of faith, and how human that faith was in all its conditions and manifestations. It is only in temptation or under trial that faith is really called for or occasioned, and so is evolved or can be brought to perfection: faith is and lives and becomes all itself only through the difficulties it encounters and overcomes, the things it suffers and survives. There is not only no other measure or manifestation of it, but also no other reason or meaning or cause of it. The divine in us needs to pass through all the necessary process of evolution, and this process is furnished by the conditions to which it is actually subjected. Under what other conditions could Jesus have been or become just what we worship and all that we worship in Him? In what other sense and for what other reason was He "perfected by the things He suffered," and what were the things He suffered but, to its utmost limit, the common lot of our common humanity. If human conditions were necessary to make, and make perfect, the human Jesus, they are necessary to make us: we need no other theodicy, nor vindication of our human lot. Jesus as the Author and Finisher, the completer and perfecter of human faith has opened up and become to us all the process and the way, through and over and *by* all that confronts us here, to God and eternal life. The only way truly to believe in Jesus is so to believe in as to share with Him the faith in God that made Him Conqueror of the world.

Not only was our Lord's faith a human faith, but equally His obedience was a human obedience. By obedience we mean the absolute conformity of His human life and self to His faith or to God the Object of His faith. Obedience is too low a term for that conformity, except that it brings it down into touch with our own so incomplete subjection to God. The obedience that transcends all mere law and rises into the love that is God, raises itself

and the law with it into the closer relation of oneness with God. The perfection of our Lord's faith and obedience manifests itself in a wonderful contrast in His own attitude respectively towards God and towards man. Towards God in His hours and agonies of doubt and fear (which were not these to Him only in so far as He met them in faith in God and willingness in Himself) He is all weakness and dependence: He is all in God just because He is nothing in Himself. "In the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him—and having been heard for His godly fear, though He was a son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and having been made perfect, He became unto all them that obey Him (i. e. that enter into the spirit and life of His own obedience) the author of eternal salvation."

On the other hand, when Jesus turns His face from Godward to manward there is no trace of doubt or fear or weakness, or even of suffering or sorrow. He speaks and acts with all the certitude, authority and calmness of God Himself. He whom God has sent to manifest and express Himself *in* (and not merely *to*) man, must come as man, not in appearance only but in fact; but He must come in each act and stage in the perfection of God in man. And so Jesus unhesitatingly and unflinchingly turns towards man the aspect of the victor and conqueror of and over sin, sorrow, death and hell in the name and power of God.

As to the matter and form of our Lord's human obedience, they are expressed in the three intimately and inseparably connected terms, love, service, sacrifice. That "love is what love does" is a commonplace or axiom of thought and feeling. And what does love do? Is there any possible answer but that of our Lord's life? "The Son of Man is come into the world not to be served but to serve." And what in turn is service, what is the essence of it and what is the measure and limit of it? Again, is

there any other answer than this, "The Son of Man is come not to be ministered unto but to minister, *and to give His life*." There is much more in the giving of life in sacrifice than the mere suffering of bodily death, but let that appear as we proceed further. For the present let us try to take in the extent of the truth that even in the commonest judgment and sentiment of the world we value a gift or an offering or a service (as such) just in proportion to what it cost the offerer to render it: that is in proportion to what and how much not only of his own but of himself he has put into it. All the real worth of a gift as a gift, and not merely as a thing, is in what the giver has put into it of thought, of affection and goodwill, of his own and of himself. In a word, the instinct even of the unthinking world teaches it to attach no real and abiding value to any act or character or person in which or in whom self-sacrifice is not, or was not, the distinguishing and essential element and principle.

We approach now to the all-important question, just where and how comes in the distinctive and proper fact of *revelation* in the work and in the person of Jesus Christ. I mean revelation in the sense of divinely communicated and not humanly discovered knowledge, of which we are in possession—which we never ourselves could have attained, but to which we can "set our seals" as eternally true when in any way communicated or revealed to us.

Men have been found to compare and even confuse John the Baptist and Jesus as founder or founders of the Kingdom of God, and again St. Paul and our Lord as Author or Authors of the Gospel of salvation. It is sufficient to refer to John's and Paul's own testimony and attitude in that matter: as well as to every page of the New Testament as the record and report of the actual impression made by Jesus upon the world. We do not hesitate to speak of the work of John the Baptist and St. Paul as ministries, acts, or works of God, for we believe that God was in them and even did them. In the life

of grace in any and every true believer, as described by such a witness as St. Augustine, the true Doer and Worker is God, however it must be also the believer himself,—and so we say of the ultimate and highest in Christ that He must (for the end in view) be man, and yet—before this and above this and *for* this—must be God. Between Him as thus absolutely Man as well as God and all others there is this vast difference, which we must as we can try to depict to ourselves.

In the case of the holiest, most righteous, and divinest man other than our Lord there is this anomaly: just in proportion to his actual holiness does he feel himself a sinner; just in proportion to his righteousness does he know himself a transgressor. The explanation is this: the further he proceeds in the life of faith and obedience, of love and grace, the more he realizes and appreciates the eternity of his quest and the infinitude of his task of righteousness. Its only limit is—to be perfect as his Father in heaven is perfect, its only end and aim is to be son of God in the plentitude of the divine image and likeness. Think of St. Paul proclaiming, I have already attained, I am already perfect! Or St. John asserting, I have no sin! And then look from them to the self-assertion and personal claim of Jesus. Was He either less humble or less truthful than they? His faith, His obedience were not different in kind from theirs, yet how infinitely beyond them in attainment and in degree! Think of it—to be able to say in utter certitude and manifest truth—and in as utter selflessness and humility—"My Father worketh and I work; I and my Father are one." "He that seeth me seeth the Father!"

Those are none the less divine utterances because they were equally human utterances. The Son of Man was not here to voice God in His infinite aloofness from humanity but in His even more divine oneness with humanity. How could God make Himself really one with a humanity that was not thereby itself—in all the con-

stituents and factors of its selfhood—one with Him? When we look at Jesus Christ in all the perfection of His human divinity and divine humanity, the question inevitably arises, Which was He, God or man? If we say as we must—Both;—then it comes back to us: But which *first*, and as ground and cause of the other? Is God human in Him because or by act of man? Or is man divine in Him because and by act of God? Does man or God originate and consummate the unity?

In seeing (as it has) in Christ, primarily God in man and only secondarily man in God, Christianity has done its best to express the Incarnation in human language; but whether or not it has successfully done so, or makes itself intelligible and understood in doing so, the fact (implicit if not explicit) remains and will remain, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, and that by consequence *in Christ* man is at one and is one with God, is *de facto* reconciled and saved—if he will receive and know it.

The two extreme and supreme affirmations of Christianity, the Incarnation of God and the Resurrection of man rest upon the claim and the fact that Jesus humanly accomplished oneness with God through faith, realized sonship with God through obedience, and consummated both these through the progressive holiness and righteousness of His entire life, but supremely and conclusively in the act in which He Himself said, "It is finished!"—the act in which "through the eternal Spirit He offered up Himself without spot to God."

It is impossible to express Christianity otherwise than in the extremest terms, even as it could be enacted "to its finish" only in the extremest acts. Nothing less than death and life will adequately or even at all express it: human evolution must of necessity pass through such crises. As the brute or animal in man must wholly die in him (as such) to give place to the rational and free, the human;—so the rational and free as the merely rational

in him, the *self* in him, must undergo nothing less than death in order to live again in the spiritual or the divine. I spoke of the death of the animal *as such* in order to the life of the rational or human: the animal dies in the human only *as animal*. It does not become extinct, but is taken up into the human and made the instrument and material of its rationality and freedom. A man is not temperate or pure or virtuous outside of his animal needs and instincts and appetites and affections: he must mortify and extinguish them only as *mere* such—i. e. as lusts or passions. As we are constituted, we can be pure only *in* our flesh, but that only by taking it up into the sphere of reason and freedom and making it the instrument of ourselves, not as animals or brutes but as men.

So when we speak again of our dying even in our higher human selves of natural reason and freedom, of mere legal or ethical or moral righteousness and life, we do not mean that our own use of our reason or our will, that our natural wisdom or morality, is to be abandoned and become extinct. What we do mean is this: That, just as instinct or appetite or passion—*as* mere such—must be wholly transcended and superseded by and in the subjection and exercise of them in conformity with reason and freedom,—so our natural reason and freedom themselves must in turn, and in the process of their yet higher evolution, be transcended and superseded by subjection to and conformity with the higher power of the spiritual and divine that lie above them—that are, as we say, supernatural and superrational: superrational because they are the eternal and divine reason itself, of which our finite reason is but an adumbration, and our wisdom and morality only our own attempt at conformity to it.

How clearly now, from the higher standpoint of the spiritual, can we see the necessity of that stage or dispensation in our human evolution to which is given the name of The Law. It was essential that, through it and by it, humanity should be made to do its part in the predestined

oneness and fellowship of God and His world. Let science and art, ethics and politics, philosophy and divinity do their natural part, elicit, discipline and prove man's natural powers. What is law but fact or reality in process —or rather the mere process itself of inexorable and inevitable fact or reality. And the ultimate and necessary fact to which all things, and above all, all persons—all hearts and minds and souls and selves—must come in this world, is expressed in the words Right and Righteousness. The lowest intelligence can recognize the fact that "nothing is settled until it is settled right." The consensus of reason and experience, of wisdom and prudence, of ethics and religion is the fact, the imperative and uncompromising condition of human life. It is impossible to lower the end and aim of human existence below the claim and demand of universal and absolute Righteousness. The Law then in its extremest expression is only the statement of an absolute fact, that cannot be compromised or modified.

There is an address in the Prayer Book to one under sentence of death for crime, which begins in these words: "Dearly beloved, it hath pleased Almighty God in His justice to bring you under the sentence and condemnation of the law!" We are all criminals and must all come under the sentence and condemnation of the law; can it be true, both, that we are "Dearly beloved," and that it "pleases God" to bring us "under the sentence and condemnation of the Law"? How can He Who is Love and Father take pleasure in bringing His children under the awful penalties of the Law? Let us try to put ourselves into the highest and truest attitude of the criminal in response to such an address coming to him in the name of Almighty God Himself. It will involve all possible comprehension and understanding on his part at once of the justice and of the love of God towards him. From that highest and truest standpoint, if he should attain it, let me endeavour to speak for him.

God "in His justice" has brought me into this condemnation; what do I understand by "His Justice"? It means that He upholds His law, that He will not compromise its claims or lower its demands upon me: the sentence holds, Do it and live by it, or do it not and die by it. I will not attempt to say what is due to God Himself in this assertion and enforcement of His divine authority and right,—but let me look at it as it concerns myself. What is this law which I have transgressed and under whose sentence and condemnation I stand? Is it not my own law as well as God's? That is to say, the law of my own life, and of all the life that interests or concerns me. We call it the law of righteousness—well, what is righteousness, but the establishment and maintenance and inviolability of eternal and universal *Good*—physical good, moral good, spiritual good! We need not go now into a distinction of these successive and ascending goods—their relation, connection and dependence. It is enough to know that our law—or God's law as concerns us—would unify and identify us with the good of things, the good of our kith and kind, the good of God. How, in the very nature—the reason, meaning, intent and actual operation—of such a law, can its claims be compromised or its penalties averted? They follow by natural and inevitable consequence; to ask for exemption or relief from them is to ask that things and their consequences shall not be what they are. The one thing in the universe we should love and not pray to be saved from is God's Law, for it is the sole condition and expression of our own, as of all, completion, perfection, and blessedness: all prayer should be addressed to being saved *to* it, not from it.

But this goes only half way; it is only saying that to annul the natural consequences of law is not only to contradict the nature of things but to overthrow the whole scheme and process of good in the world. There is a nearer need that the transgressor should be brought under the sentence and even execution of the law. As matters

are, we shall never be brought to know what holiness, righteousness, life (and these are the names of spiritual, moral, and natural Good) are, until we learn to see what their opposites are. We may well thank God that He brings us up face to face with all the inherent and inseparable penalties of sin—the inevitable judgment, sentence, yes—and actual execution of the law. We must all die,—not merely in the body, but in the soul and in the spirit. We must realize that we have crucified the Lord of Life—the divine in ourselves—the sonship to God in which and for which we were created. It is not until we know the death and the hell of the sin in which we are, that we can know the life and the blessedness of being in the love and the grace and the fellowship of God in Christ. God does not spare us the death that is the condition, the cost and the price of the life. His justice is the perfection of His love. It is because we are His well-beloved that it is His pleasure to subject us to the poverty that is the condition of our wealth, the death in ourselves which is necessary to, and but the obverse of, life in Him.

What, then, finally, is the revelation of God to us in Christ? To state it first superficially: It is the Object Lesson of the Eternal Divine Intent and Meaning of humanity, the predestination, spiritual re-creation, and ultimate destiny of man. So far I have spoken mainly if not wholly of God in the human life-struggle or life-process of Jesus Christ—the faith that sees and knows God, the obedience that identifies itself with and manifests God, the self-sacrifice that crowns and completes the at-one-ment. But we do not thus see God only in man: it is contrary to reason to try to divorce the meaning of man from that of his environment—to find in his outcome a reason and a meaning for himself and not also for the process and conditions by which he has realized himself. The Logos of man is the Logos of nature, for it is nature that has produced and includes all that is natural

in man—even all his natural potentiality and affinity for the spiritual or the divine, his instincts or intuitions of God. What is distinction after must have been predestination before; what produces ends must have been means. And that all has come as it were automatically, by a process of seeming self-evolution, only reveals as more perfect the reason and meaning of it all.

So the divine in Christ reveals itself as the divine no less in nature and in creation—and no less also as the eternal and infinite divine in God. But as we identify, so also must we distinguish between the Logos as universal and coequal with God and the Logos as Christ. Christ, as such, is the same Logos, but the same distinctively *as in man*, that is to say, as Incarnate, as the eternal reason and realization of man.

The representation of the historical Christ, or Jesus, as an object lesson of Incarnation and Resurrection is—as I premised—a superficial statement of the reality or actual fact. That could indeed only stand for a "salvation by sample": it could make our Lord nothing more than an example to us of what should be true of us all. There would of course be a certain amount of revelation to us even in that: it would show us in absolute effect or result the full fact of God's answer to faith, God's real presence in human obedience or righteousness, the consummated union and unity of God and man. But such a so-called revelation to us of the thing is not necessarily to us The Thing Itself.

The Thing Itself, the True Christ, and The Real Christ, is not A Man, not even Jesus in heaven—regarded by us only *as such*. Until we see Him as humanity, as ourselves, —as God in us and us in God—until we see Him *here*, and *so*, not only in faith but in fact,—we may have something, and even much, of a revelation about Him, but we have not the revelation of Himself. For that we must have *The Real Presence* not only in His body in heaven, but in His Body upon earth.

The Fourth Gospel in the Light of Modern Scholarship

By A. T. Robertson, D. D.,
Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The Fourth Gospel challenges interest from every point of view. It is a work of supreme art, some would say "the supreme literary work of the world." It has the dramatic quality of Shakespeare, the simplicity of Homer, the profundity of Job. There are only thirty pages of it, but it tells us more about Jesus than the Synoptic Gospels and all other books in the world. The vocabulary is limited and the Greek is very simple, though accurate, vernacular *Koine*, while it breathes a Hebrew soul. It is the Holy of Holies of religious books, but it has not escaped criticism, as, indeed, it ought not to escape it. Modern men wish no fetish in their sacred books. They only ask that the canons of literary criticism be applied fairly to the Gospel of John as to Shakespeare and Homer. Certainly no one can claim that the acceptance of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is due to obscurantism on the part of modern scholars. The fiercest controversy of New Testament criticism has raged around this book. The fight is not yet over, but continually takes on new aspects as it proceeds. Lightfoot says: "The genuineness of St. John's Gospel is the centre of the position of those who uphold the historical truth of the record of our Lord Jesus Christ given us in the New Testament" (*Biblical Essays*, p. 47). Bacon agrees "with Bishop Lightfoot as to the vital character of the issues involved," while

he rejects the implications in Lightfoot's statement (*The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 2).

It is interesting to note that two of the men who made the earliest formidable attacks on the Johannine authorship withdrew their criticisms after discussion. This was not true of Edward Evanson who in 1792 began the modern attack on the Fourth Gospel, but it was true of Bretschneider who in 1820 published in Latin a short, but powerful attack on the Johannine authorship. He put forth the thesis tentatively that the book was written in the middle of the second century by a presbyter of Alexandria. But after Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen and others had answered his criticisms, he formally retracted his position and expressed his conviction of the genuineness of the book. Likewise Strauss repudiated all the Gospels as myths in his *Life of Jesus* in 1835. Under the strictures of Lücke, Neander, and De Witte he also withdrew his objections to the genuineness of John's Gospel, but he later took back this conviction. Baur boldly claimed that the Gospel of John was written between A. D. 160 and 170.

The battle waxed hot during the latter half of the nineteenth century. But step by step the date was pushed back. Zeller and Scholten made it 150, but Hilgenfeld chose 130. Renan hit upon 100 and Harnack now puts it not later than 110. Those were doughty champions who took up the cudgels against the school of Baur, men like Lightfoot, Westcott, Ezra Abbott, Godet. Today the conflict goes on. The Johannine authorship is denied by B. W. Bacon, Percy Gardner, Grill, H. J. and O. Holtzmann, Harnack, Jülicher, Loisy, McGiffert, Moffatt, Pfleiderer, Reville, Schmiedel, E. F. Scott, Wernle, Wrede. This is a formidable list of recent scholars and shows that the fight is not over. But on the other hand one can name men like Marcus Dods, James Drummond, James Orr, Sanday, Stanton, Watkins, Zahn, who have struck powerful blows in behalf of the authenticity of this Gospel.

The external evidence is much stronger than it once was, partly because of fresh discoveries. The line of argument by which the date of the Fourth Gospel is approximately fixed is simple enough. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, in his letter to Florinus (about A. D. 180) tells of his being a disciple of Polycarp, and of "the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John and others who had seen the Lord." Polycarp was martyred A. D. 155, and was a Christian eighty-six years and a personal follower of John the Apostle. Polycarp was not simply alive when John wrote the Gospel, but was intimate with him, and in his Epistle quotes the First Epistle of John. Now Irenæus quotes the Fourth Gospel a hundred times, credits the Gospel to the Apostle John, and accepts only the four Gospels which we know today as those according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Theophilus of Antioch (about A. D. 180) in his three books addressed to Autolycus, a heathen, quotes John by name as one of the Evangelists. So also Clement of Alexandria, head of the catechetical school there from A. D. 189 onward, quotes the four Gospels over four hundred times and cites John's Gospel by name. Tertullian of Carthage (about A. D. 200) quotes from almost every chapter of the Fourth Gospel and credits it to John the Apostle. But let us go back to Asia. The *Diatessaron* of Tatian is a blended harmony of the four Gospels and of these only. It begins with the first verse of the Fourth Gospel and closes with the Epilogue of this Gospel. The date cannot be later than A. D. 170, more probably A. D. 160. The discovery of the Armenian manuscript of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in 1880 led to great excitement among scholars of the world and soon (in 1888) an Arabic manuscript of the now famous book was found in Egypt. Since Tatian selected only our present four Gospels for his Harmony, it was at once clear that these Gospels had had general acceptation for a long time. Now Tatian was a disciple of Justin Martyr who in his Apologies and

Dialogue with Trypho frequently quotes from the "Memoirs of the Apostles" what we find in our four Gospels. He quotes freely, but it seems probable that he refers to our four Gospels, and the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, his pupil, seems to make it certain. If so, the date of John's Gospel goes back to A. D. 130. Lightfoot and Zahn have proven the genuineness of the seven shorter (Vossian) Epistles of Ignatius (proven by the Epistles of Polycarp to the Philippians). The date of these Epistles of Ignatius is A. D. 109–116. Zahn (*Introduction to New Testament*, III, 176) shows how unmistakable is the influence of the Gospel of John on these Ignatian Epistles: "This dependence of Ignatius upon John has been used as an argument against the genuineness of the Ignatian letters." We have thus come close to the time of John's own life, if he lived to the close of the first century, as he is generally believed to have done. There is much more confirmatory evidence in the use of the Fourth Gospel by Basilides in the first quarter of the second century, the use of it in the twentieth Clementine Homily, and by the Epistle to Diognetus. "All the discoveries of the past century proved to be favourable to the Johannine authorship of the book. No discovery has given aid to the opponents of that fact" (Hayes, *John and His Writings*, 1917, p. 129).

But did John live to this good old age? The testimony to this effect is almost unanimous. Irenæus expressly says: "John remained among them in Asia up to the time of Trajan" (*Adv. Haer.* ii. 22) and "John, the disciple of the Lord, who also lay on his breast, likewise published a Gospel while dwelling at Ephesus" (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 1). Trajan reigned A. D. 98–117. The Irenæus tradition is supported by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Eusebius, Augustine, Jerome, and other great writers, to the effect that John the Apostle lived to a good old age in Ephesus and wrote the Fourth Gospel. And yet the early martyrdom of John is championed by great names

to-day, by men like Bacon, Burkitt, Bousset, Jülicher, Loisy, Menzies, Moffatt, Pfleiderer, Schmiedel, Johannes Weiss. The testimony, it must be confessed, is more specious than convincing. We have the promise of martyrdom for James and John in the words of Jesus in Mark 10:39; Matt. 20:23. Both Origen and Jerome declared that the sufferings of John in exile in Patmos amply fulfilled the words of Jesus. The church calendars commemorate James and John as martyrs, probably because of the promise of Jesus. The only real historical evidence for the early death of John is what is called the "Papias tradition" as given by Georgius Hamartolos (George the Sinful) of the ninth century in his *Chronicle*. He says: "Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis, having become an eyewitness of this one, declares in the second book of the Oracles of the Lord that John was put to death by the Jews, having evidently fulfilled with his brother the prediction of Christ concerning him, and his own confessions and assent in regard to this." This statement is appealed to in proof of the fact that John was killed at the same time as James in A. D. 44 (Cf. Acts 12:1 f.). But he does not say that. In truth, he expressly asserts in the same paragraph: "After Domitian, Nerva reigned one year; and he, having recalled John from the island, dismissed him to live in Ephesus." Nerva reigned A. D. 96–98. The only point claimed about John's death by George the Sinful is that John suffered martyrdom when an old man in Ephesus, not in Jerusalem in A. D. 44. There is nothing at all inconsistent with the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel in this statement if it is true. But even this item will not stand examination. He appeals to Origen as saying in his commentary on Matthew that "John hath suffered martyrdom," intimating that he has learned this from the successors of the Apostles. But Hayes (*John and His Writings*, p. 132) shows that "when we consult the original we find that George has misunderstood and misinterpreted Origen, who says that John's

exile to Patmos and his sufferings there were a sufficient martyrdom in themselves to fulfil the Lord's prophecy concerning the cup he should drink, and has no slightest intimation that John was killed by the Jews either at the same time with James or at any later date." We have only fragments of the works of Papias, but the quotation made by George the Sinful does not say that John was killed at the same time as James. There is also an epitome of the Chronicle of Philip (fifth century) called the de Boor Fragment (seventh or eighth century) which says: "Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews." Moffatt (*Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 604) accepts this as conclusive evidence that Papias asserted the death of John at the hands of the Jews, though he is unwilling to say that it was at the same time as that of James. But, if Papias did say that, it would not prove that John did not live to a good old age and so could have written the Gospel. Against it, however, is the tremendous positive evidence of many early writers who must have known what Papias said. Besides, if John was put to death early, who was the John at the Jerusalem Conference mentioned in Galatians, 2:9? Schwartz (*Tod der Söhne Zebedai*, 1904) argues strongly for A. D. 44 as the date of John's death and Wellhausen (on Mark 19:39) agreed that he had proven his point. But, as we have seen, the critics have here grasped at shadows to prove a case.

There is yet another turn in the wheel. Papias, whose testimony is so doubtful about the death of John, is again appealed to. This time Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39) gives the quotation: "If, then, anyone came who had been a follower of the elders, I questioned him in regard to the words of the elders — what Andrew or what Peter said, or what was said by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James, or by John, or by Matthew, or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristion and the pres-

byter John, the disciples of the Lord, say." Eusebius understood Papias to speak of two Johns, the Apostle John and the Presbyter John, and said so. A number of modern scholars agree with the interpretation of Eusebius and credit the Fourth Gospel to this imaginary Presbyter John. Bacon, Dobschütz, Harnack, McGiffert, Moffatt, take him to be the author. Dom Chapman's book, *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel* (1911), proves, as nearly as can be proved, that there was no such man. Papias does not say that he is other than the Apostle John. He calls all the Apostles, please note, "elders" (presbyters). Peter calls himself presbyter or elder (1 Peter 5:1) as the author of II and III John does. Besides, Papias makes a contrast (Hayes, *op. cit.*, p. 139), not between two persons, but between two methods of reporting, "one by report of what John the Apostle had said, and one by hearing the Apostle himself." This is obvious on close attention. We come back to Irenæus, Polycarp, and the Apostle John. Only Polycarp stands between Irenæus and John. Irenæus says: "Then John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon his breast, did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia" (*Ad. Haer.* III. 1). Modern research not simply has not overturned this specific statement of one who knew Polycarp, John's own disciple, but has confirmed and strengthened it.

Discussion will go on as it has done in the past. Delff (*Das Vierte Evangelium wiedergestellt*, 1890; *Neue Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1890) has advanced an interesting hypothesis. He admits that the Fourth Gospel was written by the one described in the book as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." This is, in fact, the claim of the book itself (John 21:20–24). Irenæus refers to John as the one who leaned on Jesus' breast at the Supper. Delff argues ingeniously and skilfully that this disciple lived in Jerusalem (John 19:27), was an acquaintance of the high priest (18:15 f.),

was on intimate terms with Jesus and the disciples, though not one of the twelve apostles. Even Sanday (*The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 1905, pp. 98 ff.) is attracted by the hypothesis, though he still holds to the Johannine authorship as more probable. There are, however, some patent difficulties in the way of this position. For one thing, one has to suppose a "supernumerary apostle" (Sanday), who was on even more intimate terms with Jesus than the inner circle (Peter, James, and John) of the Synoptic Gospels, and yet he is not mentioned by them at all. This is, of course, possible, but highly improbable. And then this unknown intimate friend of Jesus is a companion of Simon Peter just as we see them in the early chapters of Acts. Once more, this "beloved disciple," if not John, has a special dislike for him, because his name is not mentioned in the book. Besides, the brother of John, James, is likewise passed by without specific naming. Once only "the sons of Zebedee" (John 21:2) are listed with the seven. If John is the author of this Gospel, we can see why he would not refer to himself by name and also why he would omit the name of his own brother James. So Luke has no mention of his own name in Acts, or of Titus, who was possibly his brother. In the "we sections" he has only "we" and "us." It is possible to combine this theory of Delff with the "Presbyter John" hypothesis, but there is no real gain in the suggestion of Delff. It bristles with difficulties of its own. Swete has a note in the July (1916) *Journal of Theological Studies* on "*The Disciple Whom Jesus Loved*" in which he suggests the Rich Young Ruler as the "Beloved Disciple," but this is pure hypothesis. Others have suggested John Mark. But the Irenæus tradition, to follow Moffatt's phrase, stands still in our path. "The first known commentary on any New Testament book was a commentary on the Fourth Gospel written by Heracleon, A. D. 145" (Hayes, *op. cit.*, p. 148).

Others have attacked the unity and integrity of the

Fourth Gospel, but with little success. The book hangs together in a wonderful way. Wendt (*The Gospel According to John: An Inquiry into its Genesis and Historical Value*, 1892) has proposed an apostolic kernel as the original nucleus left by John which was enlarged by a redactor or redactors. The same view is presented by Briggs (*General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, 1899). But the book is too much of a piece and the same linguistic and theological characteristics pervade the whole. There is a Prologue (1:1–18) which is a real introduction to the whole line of thought. There is no reason to regard the Prologue as a philosophical addition to the book (Harnack, *Ueber das Verhältniss des Prologs des vierten Evangeliums zum ganzen Werke*, 1892). The Epilogue (chapter 21) is by the same hand, though it may have been added later, as the book seems to end at 20:31.

The relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Apocalypse has caused special trouble because of the linguistic features of the Apocalypse. Beyond a doubt there is room for this citicism as anyone familiar with Greek can see. There are lapses in case and number, loose and free handling of infinitives and participles, less care for the regular idioms of written speech. One sees the same phenomena now and then in other parts of the New Testament, particularly in the impassioned passages of Paul's Epistles, and in the ancient Greek writers. These solecisms are especially common in the more illiterate papyri of the *Koine*. Various theories have been suggested to explain the situation. One is difference of authorship. Either John wrote the Apocalypse and not the Gospel or *vice versa*. A John is claimed by the book as the writer of the Apocalypse (Rev. 1:9). Moffatt (*Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 615) credits the Apocalypse to the Presbyter John, and the Gospel he considers of unknown authorship (*ibid.*, p. 570). Moulton (*Prolegomena*, p. 9) suggests that, if the Apocalypse is Johannine and as late as A. D. 95, either the Gospel was by another author or

was revised by the author of John 21:24. This latter suggestion is quite possible. John and Peter were regarded by the Sanhedrin as "unlearned and ignorant men" (Acts 4:13) and it is precisely the Apocalypse and II Peter that have more linguistic idiosyncrasies (Cf. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, pp. 134 ff.).

But our troubles with the critics are by no means over if the Johannine authorship is conceded as it should be. The balance of evidence is distinctly on that side and far outweighs the testimony for Plato's works or for those of Thucydides. James Drummond, himself a Unitarian and free from suspicion of prejudice in favour of the Johannine authorship, has written a powerful defense of the book, *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 1904. He says (p. 514): "In literary questions we cannot look for demonstration, and where opinion is so much divided we must feel some uncertainty in our conclusions; but on weighing the arguments for and against to the best of my power, I must give my own judgment in favour of the Johannine authorship." This is the cautious decision of a scholar who has long considered the whole problem. But it is objected that even so the book has the bias of a theological pamphlet and is devoid of historical value or objectivity. It is the subjective theorizing of a man who is anxious to make out a case, to prove the divinity of Jesus Christ (John 20:30 f.). "The narrative is composed with the set intention of proving that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology*, 1906, pp. 1 f.). But does this fact vitiate it as a veracious interpretation of Christ? The Gospel according to Matthew is also written with the set purpose of proving that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah of Jewish hope and promise. Every history worth reading has a philosophy of interpretation, else it is a mere chronicle of details. Bacon (*The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 12) makes a more serious charge: "Divine inten-

tion and operation are not interpreted by historical fact, but historical fact by divine intention and operation. What an incarnation of deity must say and do in order to make clear the redemptive plan, this is what is said and done. The selection of seven 'signs' is avowedly made for the purpose of producing faith in this sense." One is bound to reply that Bacon has misunderstood the author's statement of his purpose in 20:30 f. He does say that he wrote to create faith in Jesus, but not by the perversion of the facts. He has selected a few salient and pertinent "signs" out of many others like them that show the truth of his thesis. This is the way of all real historians and biographers and is the only way to deal with a mass of details.

It is charged that a philosophical theory colours the writer's story. His Logos doctrine is said to make Jesus a wholly unreal being and to be a mere imitation of the Stoics and Philo. Scott (*op. cit.*, p. 173) says: "There can be little doubt that by thus importing the doctrines of the Logos into the Gospel record, John is not only compelled to do violence to historical fact, but empties the life of Christ of much of its real worth and grandeur while seeming to enhance it." He has much to the same effect: "The doctrine of the Logos, born of philosophical theory, has nothing to do with the historical revelations in Jesus, and is wholly inadequate to explain it" (p. 175). Certainly the Stoics made much of the Logos as the Reason of the Universe, as Plato had done, and Heraclitus before him. Philo was fond of the term and carried it over into his interpretation of Judaism. The term lay ready to hand for John if he cared to use it to expound the eternal and cosmic relations of Jesus Christ. He did not use it as a full and complete presentation of all aspects of Christ's nature and life any more than this is true of terms like the Son of God, the Son of Man, the Messiah, the Light of the World, the Life, the Truth, the Way. But it is by no means clear that John got the word from the Stoics

or from Philo. The Jews used *Memra* (Word) in a personified sense in the Targums, and Wisdom is personified in Proverbs. Indeed, J. Rendel Harris (*The Expositor*, August to December, 1916) shows that all the distinctive phraseology in John's Prologue could have come from Proverbs 8. But John is to be commended, not condemned, for his effort to interpret Christ to the men of culture of his day.

A further objection is that the author has invented the conversations and attributed the language to Jesus for dramatic effect as Thucydides composed the Funeral Oration of Pericles. The same general style pervades the narrative portions of the Gospel and the dialogues. That is true, and beyond a doubt the words of Jesus have blended in places with the reminiscences of the author. It is, however, a pertinent question whether the style of John has not to a large extent been influenced by the mood of Jesus here seen? We have this same "Johannine" type of teaching in Luke 10:21–24; Matt. 11:25–29. This *logion*, apparently also in Q, has to be accounted for. One is reminded of the report of Socrates by Xenophon and Plato. A good discussion of this aspect of the subject is found in Askwith's *Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel* (1910) and Watson's *Mysticism of St. John's Gospel* (1916).

Once more the Fourth Gospel is discredited in comparison with the Synoptic Gospels. They are held up as objective history while the Fourth Gospel is treated as pure invention with a totally different picture of Jesus. "Which of them represents the real Jesus, is for historical criticism to determine; and the heart of the problem is the Gospel attributed to John, with its reversal of the Synoptic conception. Both conceptions cannot represent the apostolic story" (Bacon, *op. cit.*, p. 13). That puts the criticism in a nutshell. Perhaps the best answer to Bacon is to quote Moffatt, who also, with Bacon, rejects the Johannine authorship (*op. cit.*, p. 540): "The day is

now over, or almost over, when the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists could be played off against each other in a series of rigid antitheses, as though the one were a matter-of-fact and homogeneous chronicle, and the other a spiritual reading of the earlier tradition. The problem is too delicate and complex for such crude methods. Recent criticism of the Synoptic Gospels has brought them nearer to the Fourth Gospel." This is obviously true. It is no "Jesus or Christ" controversy. In each of the Four Gospels Jesus is Son of God and Son of Man. The same great lines are in each picture and Paul follows suit. The shading is different, but the portrait is the same.

The discussion will go on through the years. Men will take this view or that, but no one can be indifferent to this most wonderful of all books. "I believe the writings of John have been blotted by more penitents' tears and have won more hearts for the Redeemer than all the rest put together" (Culross, *John Whom Jesus Loved*, p. 212). "Others may have been dominant in the past. Others may rule in the present. The future belongs to John. He increasingly will come to his own" (Hayes, *op. cit.*, p. 12). John has a bold and a clear message for men of culture who have doubts because of philosophy or science. He lays all knowledge and all truth at the feet of Jesus and calls upon all thoughtful men to do the same.

The Prospects of Free Church Federation in England

By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.

The modern movement for the closer federation of the Free Churches in England may be said to have begun with the Grindelwald Conferences in 1891, 1893 and 1894. These conferences were carried on by responsible representatives both of the Anglican Church and of the Free Churches, and in them the whole question of the reunion of the churches of Christendom was debated in a very frank and thorough fashion. They served the good purpose of bringing men of very different views into close and friendly contact, and though they did not produce any appreciable result in the way of general reunion, they suggested to many of the leaders of the Free Churches that it might be possible to make a beginning by establishing somewhat closer relations between these churches first. They certainly created a new interest in the whole question, and stimulated the desire for a more catholic Christian fellowship which had already found expression in other ways. As a direct result of their work further conferences were held in England at Manchester, Bradford, London and other centres. The outcome of these was the foundation of the National Free Church Federation, mainly under the guidance of the Rev. Hugh Pryce Hughes, Dr. Berry of Wolverhampton and Dr. Mackennal of Bowdon. The aim of the Federation was to bring evangelical Nonconformists into such a union as to enable them to take concerted action in questions affecting their common

interests or the social, moral and religious welfare of the people.

The Federation gradually spread until it covered practically the whole country with local councils which worked through a Free Church parish system, and accomplished not a little in the way of evangelization. At the same time the central Council, representing the various churches included in the movement, became a powerful instrument for furthering the Free Church cause and for carrying on social and even political reform. From the first, however, it must be admitted that the council did not carry with it the wholehearted adherence and sympathy of many of the leaders of the Free Churches. One of the greatest among them, Dr. R. W. Dale of Birmingham, declined to take part in the movement on the ground that it tended to divert the churches from their main purpose, and to make of them mere political caucuses. This feeling was increased by the fact that, in consequence of the education policy of the Conservative government of the time, the Free Church Council was forced to take an active part in the agitation against their measures. Rightly or wrongly, it felt itself committed to this, and, in consequence, there is no doubt that the sympathies of many among the more Conservative denominations were alienated. In spite of this manifest cause of weakness the Free Church Council has all the time admirably served its main intention, and has given to the Free Churches a sense of corporate fellowship and power of united action which they had long lacked. As time went on the success achieved in this direction made it obvious that much more could be done if only it were possible to secure the hearty co-operation, not merely of individual churches and local councils, but of the great Free Church denominations throughout the land. There is no doubt that the Free Church Council, in spite of many obvious defects, has succeeded in educating the churches in methods of co-operation, has revealed in a startling way the failures

and hindrances due to our divisions, and has produced a genuine demand for some closer and more workable form of union.

This demand has of recent years found expression in a new scheme for the federation of the Free Churches generally known by the name of its author, the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare. Mr. Shakespeare was President of the Free Church Council in 1916, and in his presidential address on the Free Churches at the Cross Roads, he put the whole case for what he called the unity of the Free Churches of England in an extremely cogent and indeed unanswerable fashion. His main argument may be summarized as follows:

He began by reminding his hearers that the Free Churches were faced with a very serious situation, as indicated by the continuance of the decline in the number of their members and their Sunday school scholars, and that it was absolutely necessary for them to put their house in order if this decline was to be arrested. He pointed to an excessive denominationalism as one of the chief causes of weakness. Sectarian distinctions had practically ceased to be a vital issue, and the emphasis upon them now made no appeal to the conscience and intellect of the best elements of the nation outside the churches. He argued that the ancient grounds for denominational differences had disappeared, and that it was no longer necessary to maintain them, particularly when to do so involved immense waste of men, money and energy. He asked: "Is it rational or Christian that in the typical English village there should be an Anglican Church, a Baptist, Congregational, Wesleyan and perhaps a Methodist Chapel?" And he claimed that for the sake of efficiency alone it was necessary to put an end to such a condition of things. As long as it was maintained it was impossible for the Free Churches really to make themselves felt as a living force in the life of the nation, and these churches would always be impotent for good as long as their forces were divided in this way.

Mr. Shakespeare's address and the tentative proposals it contained were on the whole well received, and since that time he and others who feel an equal concern with him about the matter, have attended meetings up and down the country in order to explain the position, and generally speaking they met with a favourable hearing. The practical result has been the formation of a large conference of representatives appointed by the Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Primitive Methodist, Independent Methodist, Wesleyan Reform, Moravian, Countess of Huntingdon, United Methodist, Wesleyan Methodist, and Disciples of Christ Churches, along with representatives of the Free Church Council. This Conference first met at Mansfield College, Oxford, in September, 1916, and for a second time at the Leys School, Cambridge, in March, 1917. It appointed committees on Faith, Constitution, Evangelization and the Ministry, all of which have held many meetings in addition to those of the Representative Conference. The Oxford Conference was mainly occupied in exploring the ground, appointing committees, and laying down lines of their work. At the Cambridge Conference interim reports of all the Committees were presented and freely discussed. That of the Committee on Faith was unanimously adopted, and it is so important that we give it here in full:

The Preamble runs:

Inasmuch as the Evangelical Free Churches of England have been led, in the good providence of God, to seek closer Federation with one another for the better witness to and service of the Gospel, and inasmuch as some declaration exhibiting the substance of their common faith is desirable both as a basis of fellowship and co-operation and as a means of making known to others the truths for which these Churches stand, the following "Declaratory Statement of Common Faith and Practice" is issued in the name of the Federation. And at the same time it is intimated as follows:

(1) The Evangelical Free Churches of England claim and cherish their place as inheritors, along with others, of the historic faith of Christendom, which found expression in the oecumenical creeds of the early and undivided Church; and

this Declaratory Statement does not profess to be a comprehensive creed, but is a declaration of such truths as, in the circumstances, it seems proper to rehearse and emphasize.

2) It is an essential element in the proposals for federation that each of the federating Churches should preserve its own autonomy as regards faith and practice; this Statement, therefore, is not to be imposed as a disciplinary standard on any of these Churches, nor, on the other hand, does it supersede or in any way alter the place of whatever doctrinal standards any of these Churches may maintain in their constitution.

DECLARATORY STATEMENT OF COMMON FAITH AND PRACTICE.

I.

There is One Living and True God, Who is revealed to us as Father, Son and Holy Spirit; Him alone we worship and adore.

II.

We believe that God so loved the world as to give His Son to be the Revealer of the Father and the Redeemer of mankind; that the Son of God, for us men and for our salvation, became man in Jesus Christ, Who, having lived on earth the perfect human life, died for our sins, rose again from the dead, and now is exalted Lord over all; and that the Holy Spirit, Who witnesses to us of Christ, makes the salvation which is in Him to be effective in our hearts and lives.

III.

We acknowledge that all men are sinful, and unable to deliver themselves from either the guilt or power of their sin; but we have received and rejoice in the Gospel of the grace of the Holy God, wherein all who truly turn from sin are freely forgiven through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are called and enabled, through the Spirit dwelling and working within them, to live in fellowship with God and for His service; and in this new life, which is to be nurtured by the right use of the means of grace, we are to grow, daily dying unto sin and living unto Him Who in His mercy has redeemed us.

IV.

We believe that the Catholic or Universal Church is the whole company of the redeemed in heaven and on earth, and we recognize as belonging to this holy fellowship all who are united to God through faith in Christ.

The Church on earth—which is One through the Apostolic Gospel and through the living union of all its true members with its one Head, even Christ, and which is Holy through the indwelling Holy Spirit

Who sanctifies the Body and its members—is ordained to be the visible Body of Christ, to worship God through Him, to promote the fellowship of His people and the ends of His Kingdom, and to go into all the world and proclaim His Gospel for the salvation of men and the brotherhood of all mankind. Of this visible Church, and every branch thereof, the only Head is the Lord Jesus Christ; and in its faith, order, discipline and duty, it must be free to obey Him alone as it interprets His holy will.

V.

We receive, as given by the Lord to His Church on earth, the Holy Scriptures, the Sacraments of the Gospel, and the Christian Ministry.

The Scriptures, delivered through men moved by the Holy Ghost, record and interpret the revelation of redemption, and contain the sure Word of God concerning our salvation and all things necessary thereto. Of this we are convinced by the witness of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men to and with the Word; and this Spirit, thus speaking from the Scriptures to believers and to the Church, is the supreme Authority by which all opinions in religion are finally to be judged.

The Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—are instituted by Christ, Who is Himself certainly and really present in His own ordinances (though not bodily in the elements thereof), and are signs and seals of His Gospel not to be separated therefrom. They confirm the promises and gifts of salvation, and, when rightly used by believers with faith and prayer, are, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, true means of grace.

The Ministry is an office within the Church—not a sacerdotal order—instituted for the preaching of the Word, the ministration of the Sacraments and the care of souls. It is a vocation from God, upon which therefore no one is qualified to enter save through the call of the Holy Spirit in the heart; and this inward call is to be authenticated by the call of the Church, which is followed by ordination to the work of the Ministry in the name of the Church. While thus maintaining the Ministry as an office, we do not limit the ministries of the New Testament to those who are thus ordained, but affirm the priesthood of all believers and the obligation resting upon them to fulfill their vocation according to the gift bestowed upon them by the Holy Spirit.

VI.

We affirm the sovereign authority of our Lord Jesus Christ over every department of human life, and we hold that individuals and peoples are responsible to Him in their several spheres and are bound to render Him obedience and to seek always the furtherance of His Kingdom upon earth, not, however, in any way constraining belief, imposing religious disabilities, or denying the rights of conscience.

VII.

In the assurance, given us in the Gospel, of the love of God our Father to each of us and to all men, and in the faith that Jesus Christ, Who died, overcame death and has passed into the heavens, the first-fruits of them that sleep, we are made confident of the hope of Immortality, and trust to God our souls and the souls of the departed. We believe that the whole world must stand before the final judgment of the Lord Jesus Christ. And, with glad and solemn hearts, we look for the consummation and bliss of the life everlasting, wherein the people of God, freed for ever from sorrow and from sin, shall serve Him and see His face in the perfected communion of all saints in the Church triumphant.

These things, as all else in our Christian faith, we hold in reverent submission to the guidance and teaching of the Holy Spirit Who is Truth, and we shall ever seek of Him enlightenment and grace both to unlearn our errors and also more fully to learn the mind and will of God Whom to know is life eternal and to serve is perfect freedom.

And, being thus called of God unto the purpose of His redeeming love wherein He is delivering the world from sin and misery and is reconciling all things to Himself in Christ Jesus, and being animated with faith in the final triumph of our Lord, we set before us as our end and aim to carry the gospel to every creature and to serve and stablish, in our land and throughout the earth, His reign of righteousness, joy and peace.

Grace be with all those that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. And to God be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end: Amen.

The above statement was adopted unanimously by the Conference largely owing to the masterly way in which it was presented by the Chairman of the Committee who drew it up, the Rev. Dr. Carnegie Simpson. It has yet, of course, to be ratified by the various denominational assemblies, and there is every hope that this may be done, seeing that it is put forward as a declaratory statement and not in any sense as a creed.

Other Committees appointed by the Conference had to do with Constitution, Evangelization and the Ministry, and the work of these is not yet completed. The first named, however, recommends that the union of the Free Churches shall be on the basis of a federation, and shall be a federation of the denominations rather than of the individual churches concerned. The federation is to be

guided by a Council consisting of 200 representatives of eleven leading denominations in proportion to their numbers, and the suggested objects and powers of the Federation are as follows:

The following shall be the objects of the F deration:

1. So to express the essential unity in Christ of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and to co-ordinate their activities and resources as most effectively to promote the evangelization of the people, and the extension of Christ's Kingdom at home and abroad.
2. To bring the Evangelical Free Churches of England into Federal Union upon the basis of the Evangelical faith and of the autonomy of the federating Churches.
3. To maintain liberty of conscience and to take action where authorized in all matters affecting the interests, duties, rights or privileges of the federating Churches, when authorized to do so.
4. To enter into communion and united action where possible with other branches of the Church of Christ throughout the world.

The following shall be the powers of the Federal Council:

1. To carry into operation the duties undertaken at the recommendation of the Committees on Faith, Ministry and Evangelization, and such further duties as may from time to time be committed to it.
2. The powers to be exercised shall be advisory, except in so far as Executive functions may from time to time be entrusted to the Federal Council by the Federating Denominations.
   (*a*) In so far as the exercise of Executive functions affects all the federating Denominations no action shall be taken except by the consent of Representatives numbering together two-thirds of the entire Council.
   (*b*) In so far as the exercise of Executive functions affects one or more of the federating Denominations no action shall be taken except by the consent of the Denomination or Denominations concerned.
3. No executive functions shall be exercised by the Council without a two-thirds majority of the members of the Council then present and voting.
4. No amendment of the Constitution shall be valid unless it has been recommended by a two-thirds majority of the Federal Council then present, and has been approved by the Annual Assemblies of the Federating Denominations. If the denominations approving such amendment are represented on the Federal Council by representatives numbering two-thirds of the entire Council, but not otherwise, the Council may proceed to effect such amendment accordingly.

5. The Aims and Objects of the Federation being spiritual and moral the Council shall not entertain, neither shall any member of the Council be permitted to discuss therein, any question which, in the judgment of the Moderator, or (in the event of the Moderator's judgment being challenged) in that of one-fourth of the members of the Council voting, is not within the sphere of such aims and objects.

The Committees on Evangelization and the Ministry also reported on the practical measures necessary for co-operation on these important questions, and there is very little doubt that their recommendations in the main will be adopted by the Conference.

From this it will be seen that the Conference has gone about the whole business entrusted to it in a very careful and methodical fashion. Its work will probably be completed at a Session to be held this autumn, and then will come the task of presenting their conclusions to, and obtaining their ratification from, the various denominations concerned.

This task will certainly not be an easy one. Some of the denominations are exceedingly jealous of their autonomy and already suspect the proposals of the Conference as threatening to interfere with it. Others will resent any attempt to impose on them a declaration of faith. The whole matter will have to be dealt with in an exceedingly cautious spirit, and it will be above all things necessary to go slowly and take one step at a time. But there is no doubt that the general atmosphere is more favourable towards federation than it has ever been. The experience of work among the soldiers has created a strong feeling against any excessive denominationalism, and has made the need for closing the ranks of the Churches imperative. With goodwill on all sides a great deal may now be accomplished and there is every hope that before long the Free Churches may be brought into a really living union, and that this may prepare the way for a still wider federation of all the Churches of Christendom.

Protestantism and the Development of the Church

By Herbert Symonds,
Vicar, Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal.

The question to which an answer is sought in this essay is whether the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century may be regarded as a period in the development of the Christian Church, or whether it is to be regarded as a revolt and breaking away from the Church, and therefore a mere episode, and, as some would say, a highly unfortunate episode, in the history of Christianity.

The scope of our subject is somewhat wider than Newman's famous essay which deals only with Christian Doctrine, its full title being *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.* Newman's *Essay,* it is sometimes forgotten, was written before he formally joined the Church of Rome and even before he had finally decided on this step. The arguments of capable Protestant writers, against the contention of Bossuet and others, that the Roman claim of doctrinal unchangeableness was not historical, was admitted (as indeed it had been before by Petavius) by Newman, but he argued that the "large variations of teaching in its (the Church's) long course of eighteen hundred years . . . will be found to arise from the nature of the case, and to proceed on a law and with a harmony and a definite drift, and with an analogy to Scripture revelations, which, instead of telling to their disadvantage, actually constitute an argument in their favour, as witnessing to a Superintending Provi-

dence and a great Design in the mode and in the circumstances of their occurrence." [1] The doctrine of development, therefore, *as stated by Newman*, supports with a new weapon the contention that Protestantism (and Newman, of course, included in his argument the Anglican Church) lies completely outside of the Holy Catholic Church, and is but an episode, like Novatianism or Donatism, in the history of the Church.

With Newman's main contention, so far as Protestantism is concerned, the Anglo-Catholic school of thought is largely agreed. But, so far as I know, none of its theologians have accepted or at any rate applied the Doctrine of Development to the history of Christian thought or to that of the Church in general. Anglo-Catholics are becoming divided among themselves, so that it is not so easy today to define their position as it would have been ten or fifteen years ago. But speaking generally, the Anglo-Catholic school regards the Reformation as a mistake and Protestantism as lying outside the Church. Their test of the true Church is, however, neither Roman nor Greek. So far as doctrine is concerned, its appeal is to the Ecumenical Councils. So far as organization is concerned the test is the possession of the Apostolical Succession of bishops. Tried by these tests it finds three branches of the true Church—the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican.

Such in simple and non-polemical terms is the situation in the western portion of Christendom to-day. My contention, urged not with controversial intent, but in the interest of a closer fellowship between Christian folk, is that Protestantism was a genuine and necessary development of Christianity, is not to be regarded as a limb lopped off from the main stem, and ought not to be excluded from *fellowship*, even though complete unity cannot yet be achieved. Nevertheless it is my belief that strictly speaking the era of Protestantism is over.

[1] *Development of Doctrine:* Preface to the Third Edition.

Few indeed of the Protestant theologians of our foremost colleges start with the presuppositions of the Reformers, or use the methods of study or arrive at the conclusions of the theological writers of the sixteenth, seventeenth or eighteenth centuries. The reactions of Modern Science, Historical Criticism and Philosophy upon Theology constitute a new age and the starting point of a new development which in its turn grows out of the Reformation.

I.

We turn to the consideration of the nature and legitimacy of the Reformation regarded as a stage in the development of Christianity.

Christianity has, as its fundamental doctrine, the Fatherhood of God, revealed through Jesus Christ His Son. Its purpose is the regeneration of the world and its ultimate salvation. This purpose is realized through the medium of the Church. But when we say the Church, we meet with the first great antinomy in Christian Doctrine. Is man saved through the Church, or is he saved by personal relationship with God through Christ? The answer seems to me to be, Both. Only the Church must be conceived of not as a *hierarchy* but as a *family*. No man is ever regenerated or sanctified by direct or exclusive communion between God and his soul. Always there is some human mediation. The father or mother, brother or sister, pastor or teacher. These may and should lead on to the personal individual union with God revealed in Christ through the Spirit. Conceive of the Church as the family of God the Father, and the old controversies about the Church and the Individual lose most of their significance. To Newman the Church was essentially hierarchical. But a hierarchy is not of the essence of the Church. It can only be admitted at all as a stage in its development. But the

conception of the Church as a family is a higher and truer conception of the Church than that of a hierarchy. The doctrine of Man's Sonship to God is no less prominent in the New Testament than that of the Fatherhood of God. Nor is it a mere figure of speech. "Partakers of the Divine Nature" St. Peter calls the redeemed. So from both the Divine and human aspects of the Church it is revealed as fundamentally a family.

But this was a conception that soon fell into the background and then to all intents and purposes out of sight. The Gospel was transplanted from the soil in which it was first sown to the very different environment of the Graeco-Roman world, the world of philosophical speculation on the one hand, and of legalism and imperialism on the other. It is in the study of the transformation undergone by the primitive Gospel as described by such brilliant theologians as Edwin Hatch, and, more recently, Kirsopp Lake, that we learn the mighty power of environment to modify ideas. Not that the older Protestantism was right when it supposed that Christianity after a period called "primitive," was completely eclipsed and only brought to light in the Reformation. The notion of development delivers us from such a startling and depressing conclusion as this. "Primitive Christianity perished in order that the Gospel might live," it has been said. In terms of our subject, Christianity transplanted to a new soil was compelled to adapt itself to the new environment, and by so doing showed its vitality.

Nevertheless, the transformation gradually undergone by primitive Christianity during the first four centuries can scarcely be exaggerated. In some respects, more particularly perhaps in respect of ethics, men of the Middle Ages were conscious of this transformation. So Dante perceives the ethical gulf which separated the Papacy of his day from the Primacy of St. Peter. But it is only in modern times that this entire process of change can be described and interpreted. And when this has

been done we may apply to its history the French proverb: "To know all is to forgive all."

The unfolding of the *idea* of Christianity involved three things, viz., Doctrine, Organization and Worship. Christianity is an Idea and therefore requires a doctrine for its explication. It is a Society and therefore requires an organization. It is a Religion and therefore calls for worship. Now it is in the gradual development of its doctrine, its organization and its worship, that the manifold influences of environment may be traced. Its doctrine was shaped by men who were the heirs of the Greek philosophers. Its organization followed the lines of that of the Roman Empire. Even its worship was moulded by its environment. The etiquette of the Imperial Court was transferred with all its pomp and circumstance to the Cathedral Court of the Most High. Gregory of Nyssa in clearest terms explains this *rationale* of Christian worship in the following passage:

"Inasmuch as men, when approaching Emperors and potentates for the objects they wish in some way to obtain from those rulers, do not bring to them their mere petition only, but employ every possible means to induce them to feel pity and favour towards themselves, clasping their knees, prostrating themselves on the ground, and putting forward to plead for their petition all sorts of pathetic signs to wake that pity, so it is that those who recognize the true Potentate . . . when they are supplicating for that which they have at heart . . . carry the ceremonial in use of men into the Service of the Deity." Upon such words Dr. A. V. G. Allen comments as follows:— "The ceremonial motive was the adaptation or reproduction of the Court Etiquette of an Oriental Monarch, as the standard for symbolizing or dramatizing the soul's approach to God." [2]

---

[2] Allen's *Christian Institution*, p. 539.

II.

It is not necessary to elaborate this truth any further. No doubt there is room for much difference of opinion as to the extent of the influences of environment upon the development of Christianity, but of the fact itself there can be no question. Our brief review of it prepares us for the examination of the Protestant Reformation with a view to the consideration of its claim to be a true development in the Christian Church.

The Reformation was not in its first beginnings a "Protestant" Reformation, or at any rate only in a limited measure. It was the result of a long series of movements for reform, promoted or shared in by generations of faithful adherents of the Mediaeval System. The reader need only consult the pages of so impartial a history of the Papacy as that of the late Bishop Creighton to realize, if he has ever doubted, the vast need of Reform. The *moral environment* then may be described as the first cause of the Reformation.

But all attempts at Reform without touching the *doctrinal system* of the Church failed. Nevertheless, doctrinal change sprang directly out of a question of morals. No Reformer sat down at the outset of the Reformation to elaborate a new system of Christian Doctrine. But out of his own inner needs and in connection with what he felt to be the horrible abuse of the doctrine of indulgences, Luther was roused to his enquiry into the nature of indulgences.

How does the doctrine of justification by faith which Luther thus came to formulate stand related to the essential Gospel? Luther found his central doctrine in the Epistle to the Galatians. And the summing up of the argument of that Epistle is surely to be found in the words: "Therefore thou art no more a servant but a son." The fundamental doctrine of the Reformation is a clearer statement of the doctrine of the Fatherhood

of God and the Sonship of Man. It is true that this doctrine was once more obscured in the teaching of Calvinism, but that does not concern us here. What does concern us is to maintain that this proclamation of Luther's was a step forward in the apprehension of Christianity, clearly proceeding out of the original seed. For the Fatherhood of God and the Sonship of Man, revealed through Christ's life, word and work, is the fundamental idea of Christianity itself, the very germ. Luther's doctrine was no new idea; it was not the planting of a new seed. It was a true development. But this development was not independent of its environment. This doctrine of Luther's came "in the fulness of time." The barbarians of Northern and Central Europe when first the Mediaeval Church evangelized them were but spiritual children. They had to go to the school of law provided by the Mediaeval Church, but in that school the children grew up to youth, and by the sixteenth century they were prepared for the liberty of the grown-up son. So St. Paul explained both the necessity and the transitoriness of the Jewish law, and his words are marvellously applicable to the mediaeval period of the Church and the Reformation: "Now I say that the heir so long as he is a child differeth nothing from a servant though he is lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world; but when the fulness of time was come God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law; to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father. *Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son.*"

The Reformation is not a schismatical movement. It had not its beginnings in a schismatical spirit. No doubt when the appeal for Reform once again, as so often

before, met with little or no response from authority, many deplorable things were said and done on both sides. And so at last the breach came, and yet, as we can see today, it was far less complete in the realm of doctrine than appeared to many generations of both Roman Catholics and Protestants, and it is probably true to say that a Protestant of the type of Melanchthon was nearer to the Roman Church than a Liberal Protestant of today is to Melanchthon.

However, the breach came and Protestantism had to organize itself. An effort was made to go clear back to the New Testament and to reorganize upon purely New Testament lines. It seems a reasonable proposition. Doctrine, Organization, Worship—what were these in the New Testament Church? Rediscover, re-publish them and you will have a Church that all must admit. But History has forever proved the impossibility of this seemingly simple task. Our forefathers did not see why. Some of them thought they had succeeded in attaining their object. But when men of equal scholarship and integrity found respectively Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism in the same documents, it is clear that there was something wrong with their methods or presuppositions. What was wanting to them was the conception of development under the influence of environment.

The Reformers were, however, though quite unconsciously, influenced by their environment. It was the influence of environment, e.g., that led to their organization into National Churches. The great political movement of the fifteenth century, the century that preceded the Reformation, was the centralization of the national power in the hands of the kings. Previously to this century, the power of the barons, even of individual barons, was sometimes equal to that of the kings. The fifteenth century is the century of "the last of the barons." In France, England and Spain the movement is the same.

The Holy Roman Empire grows less and less and the nations grow more and more. The interference of the Papal power with national rights was a secular cause of the Reformation. "And now," writes Freeman, "men were beginning to be discontented with the power of the popes through the same causes which had made the power of the emperors die away. That is to say, Christendom was split up into separate nations and kingdoms, and Rome no longer kept its place as centre of all."

There was no theological reason why the Reformation should have involved the formation of National Churches. It was simply the influence of environment upon organization. The idea prevailed that the religion of the State should be the religion of the people—*Cujus regio, ejus religio* is the motto that sums up the, to us, very unsatisfactory theory of the time. Queen Elizabeth regarded all ecclesiastical disobedience as treasonable. Nonconformists, though fellow-Protestants, were therefore persecuted. They were not necessarily regarded as outside the pale of the Church of Christ, as in Tractarian theory, for England continued to show a friendly attitude to the non-Episcopal Churches of the Continent, and the validity of their orders was admitted in high quarters.

III.

It is now four hundred years since the Reformation. The Protestant Churches have stood the test of time. They have been associated with many great and fruitful movements of the last three centuries. Their literary, theological and scientific output has been enormous, as have been their contributions to education and to philanthropic and missionary achievements.

We conclude then that Protestantism, whether tried by doctrinal, ecclesiastical or practical tests, can establish a good claim to be regarded as a true development of Christianity.

But the development of the Church is not yet ended. Indeed Christianity may still be in little more than its early youth, as Mr. Jacks is disposed to think is the case with civilization. To establish a claim to be a part of the Church Universal is no sufficient ground for self-satisfaction. The very argument that satisfies us of the legitimacy of Reformed Christendom, leads us to the conviction that the process of development is far from having achieved its goal. If in the moulding of its external forms of organization, creed and worship, environment has had a large influence, is it not certain that this moulding force will produce yet other forms? In the past these forces have been vehemently resisted, giving rise to interminable controversy, religious wars and persecutions of the cruellest kind. Can we not with the light of all past experience, and with that knowledge which our fathers had not, of the laws of social evolution, avoid some at least of their mistakes, and work with rather than against the inevitable?

For no candid study of the manifold signs of the times can possibly lead to any other conclusion than that we are already living in a new era. The age of the Reformation is over. It would be hard to exaggerate the width of the gulf which separates a modern scholar, in his approach to the Bible or to Church History, from a typical Reformer of the sixteenth century. The two begin with vastly different presuppositions, and they proceed by entirely different methods. In other words, the environment of the scholar is new.

So too is the political environment. That environment has for more than a century been growing increasingly democratic. But it is only the war which has revealed to us how democratic we have become, and how impossible it is for us to think in any other terms than those of democracy. It is indeed amusing to observe in some quarters a fervent loyalty to the democratic cause of the allies against the tyranny of the Kaiser, and else-

where, possibly in the same number, the equally fervent loyalty to the memory of King Charles the Martyr! There are not a few people who have as yet been unable to correlate their new vision of democracy with the old theory of Divine right of Kings, Popes or Bishops. The war has brought some latent contradictions up to the surface with curious results.

We have seen how ecclesiastical polity tends to adapt itself to the secular polity of its time. What then has the democratic polity of our times to teach the Church? In what ways will the democratic environment affect the Church?

(1) Ever since the Reformation, the Reformed Churches have tended steadily in the direction of Democratic Government. The force of this tendency may be roughly measured by its extension to the Anglican Church everywhere outside England. Even in England, in theory at least, the same process has gone on. For the Parliament is the governing body of the Church, and the Prime Minister appoints the Bishops as representative of the people. But in the United States and in the Dominions of the British Empire, the Anglican Church is a democracy with the elected Bishop as the chief executive officer. The laity have in some places a larger representation than the clergy. No doubt the Bishops have a large measure of influence, and their personal power is in practice, perhaps, somewhat greater than is sometimes desirable. This is, however, a mere detail. It is no longer actually the case (if indeed it ever were so) that the Anglican Communion is governed by Bishops. They are the chief executive officers of a constitutional and democratic body. The democratic principle is thus recognized, and will no doubt increase in effectiveness as time goes on.

A profoundly interesting question has to do with the ecclesiastical politics of the Russian Church. Its future will illustrate the extent of the truth of our principle

that the forms of Church Government tend to follow those of Secular Government. The resignation of the Czar implies in itself a revolution in the Church. Religious freedom has been declared. Will the Russian Church, whilst following a line of its own, be influenced by the history and shaped by the models of Reformed Christendom? Or will it cling to "Catholic" forms? The answer to this question depends, I think, upon two things. First, upon the result of the war, and secondly, upon the extent of the success of the United States in Russia. Given the complete success of the allies, with the establishment of cordial relations between the United States and Russia, and we may perhaps come to look there for light and leading both religious and in secular politics.

(2) An extension of the *principle* of democracy implies an extension of the principle of liberty. All the theological developments of our time seem to point in the same direction. The results of historical criticism and of natural science have greatly weakened the binding power of dogma. This, however, is not to say that modern science is destructive of theology. Dogma in the proper sense of the word is a theological statement or decree, regarded as finally binding. The tendency of modern thought not only from the side of science, but almost more from that of history, is destructive of this conception of dogma. All statements of theology must in form at least be regarded as provisional. It is at least conceivable that any statement of doctrine is susceptible of improvement. It is certain that many forms in our old confessions and creeds could be expressed more harmoniously with modern thought. There is a human and therefore changeable element in every creed. The emphasis in our estimate of Churches and individuals is steadily shifting from form to life. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is a text the man on the street heartily endorses, and who shall say that he is wrong? Com-

pulsion, again, as a mode of ensuring adherence to law, is more and more out of favour—a necessary evil. The compulsion of reason, persuasion and love is the better way, and pre-eminently in matters of religion. And this growing liberty which is an ideal of democracy must find its field of operation in the sphere of doctrine, organization and worship.

(3) But liberty in and by itself is a disintegrating, individualizing and even destructive force. The Church of the past was right in its conviction that men must be held together, but wrong in its supposition that the only force that can hold them together is compulsion. A union of compulsion is no *unity of the Spirit.* And without the unity of the Spirit there can be no true unity. The disintegrating but progressive force of liberty must be balanced and harmonized by the unifying and conservative force of love. These two apparent antagonists must be harmonized. Liberty is the centrifugal and Love is the centripetal force in the world of Spirit. In this material world, out of their antagonism, springs the universe. Towards a similar unity the world of humanity, dowered at once with the liberty of the sons of God and with divine love, moves.

Is it not possible for all churches to tend towards such larger fellowship? In view of what is most secure in modern methods and modern results in the field of history and of psychology, in view of the plain facts of the great achievements of all the leading forms of Christianity, does not the compass of the Ark of Christ point towards mutual recognition of each other's contribution to the world's welfare, and to that measure of fellowship that will neutralize the onesidedness of each of these three forms taken by itself. What I mean is perhaps nowhere more beautifully expressed than in St. Paul's words to the Romans whom he had not as yet visited. "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established; that is,

that I may be comforted *together with you by the mutual faith both of you and me.*"

In much of the best secular literature inspired by the war, the figure of Christ is lifted high. Men are coming back to the Cross and the Resurrection as the interpretation of what we to-day endure and to-morrow hope for. But I do not find in that literature any expectation of help from the Church. May it not be because the Church is still fighting about dead issues, and leaving the live issue untouched. I do not mean that the things the Church fights about are of no moment, but the particular issue is often a dead one. Mass *or* Holy Communion, Priest *or* Prophet, Liturgy *or* no Liturgy, Bishop *or* Presbyters. The answer of the Spirit of Fellowship is, Both. Let us lay to heart the issue as the secular novelist sees it: "There was deep silence as O'Rane paused." (O'Rane, who had been crucified and totally blinded in the war.) "I—all of us who were out there have seen it—we can't forget. The courage, the cold, heart-breaking courage . . . and the smile on a dying man's face . . . we must never let it be forgotten; we've earned the right. As long as a drunkard kicks his wife, or a child goes hungry, or a woman is driven through shame to disease and death . . . is it a great thing to ask? To demand of England to remember that the criminals and loafers and prostitutes are somebody's children, mothers and sisters? And that we've all been saved by a miracle of suffering? Is that too great a strain on our chivalry?" [3]

That is the challenge to the Church. A challenge that can only be met by the unity of Spirit and the fellowship in effort of all who love in the interest of those who suffer.

---

[3] *Sonia:* by Stephen McKenna (Methuen & Co., London).

Preparation for the World Conference[1]

By Newman Smyth, D.D.

During the period from 1545, the year in which the Council of Trent was held, down through the seventeenth to the opening years of the eighteenth century, there were held in Europe five conferences of representatives from the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and Reformed Churches for the express object of making peace between these communions. During this same period some six or more conferences of importance were held in the effort to reunite the Protestant Churches, or "dissidents," as they were then often designated. Besides these, numerous lesser movements, as well as a large amount of correspondence, for the same object show that there were prophets of peace even in the midst of the controversial theologies of those times. Since then no such general conferences have occurred, although irenic voices have now and then been heard.

At length after over three centuries of the continuance of the people of God in the state of sinful schism, another Conference is to be held, larger, more far-reaching, and with more providential preparation for it than ever before. Others before us have sowed; what shall our harvest be? Those endeavours in the past all came to naught. The earlier voices of peace were lost as the songs of the birds in the storms. But their failures may show us how better to succeed; to many of their words,

[1]A paper read at the meeting of the North American Preparatory Conference, January 23rd, 1917.

of which our Church histories have taken little note, we may well take heed.

In view of these historical precedents, mindful of many utterances which are to be found in the reports of these forgotten conferences, I would submit to-day with the more urgent confidence some suggestions with regard to the way in which our immediate work of preparation for the approaching World Conference should be undertaken. I need not dwell upon the indispensableness of thorough mutual preparation; all the failures of past efforts show that. Delegates to former conferences went each party with its formulated beliefs and chosen speakers; they held a disputation, and not a conference. What I would now address myself to directly concerns the methods that may be pursued in the preparatory work of the subject-matter for conference. This preparatory work must be thoroughly done if similar confusion of tongues is not to fall upon us likewise in the end.

I. First, then, the method should be one of clarity and charity. I take this note from the opening address made in August, 1645, by the Commissioner of the king of Poland, who had called Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Reformed to meet in conference at Thorn,—an address which in many paragraphs would be strikingly adapted to our meeting to-day. He urged each side to express its opinions concerning the teachings in question in "brief, simple, and clear sentences." He said, "It should all be made clear as the noon-day what each side really taught, and what was falsely attributed to it as its teaching." Above all, in doing this there should be avoided the introduction of proofs, "except what may be implicit in the statement itself. For first," he said, "we have not to deal with this, whether the one or the other party *rightly* believes, but only *what* it believes." He reminded the conference that throughout he had avoided the word "disputation." So much for clarity. As for charity, he observed that "they had learned through the experience

of a century that religious controversies are hard to end because there is no one living to act as judge, who can be heard and in whose decision one may rest." Then urging them to free and brotherly discussion (not disputation) he continued, "Only this way to peace stands still open. If we attain nothing in this way, then it must be said that Christ left no means remaining whereby the brothers may come back to unity, although they may warmly desire it; and that would be to affirm what is most preposterous and shameful for the Christian religion, and a grievous offense to Christ, who is King of Kings."

That conference at Thorn ended in failure, because hardly had its sessions begun before it forsook the straight and narrow way of clarity and charity, and entered the broad way in which many polemical divines rush to destruction. Their sessions became a series of attacks and counter attacks, as ours too may become if we fail to make beforehand brotherly preparation. It is also well worth our noticing that they soon drifted and were broken up on the shoals of superficial and deceptive denials by each of errors attributed to others. By their affirmations they might have been united; by their negations they were divided. A century before that conference at Thorn the Council of Trent was convened. Take up now the acts and discussions of the former, and the decrees of the latter. Or take any two opposing confessions of faith. Go through each, crossing out in each what it denies as errors attributed to the other. Then put them side by side and compare them in their affirmations with one another. One may be surprised to discern how much in both he may find in which he may agree; how well within the limits at least of that charity that "thinketh no evil" their affirmations of Christian faith may be held. Go through the creeds of Christendom, striking out their anathemas, passing over all their denials; hold up their great affirmations in the light of the

life of the Christ, and know how from age to age according to His promise His Spirit has been leading His Church into the truth. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, Who has been preached among us, was not yea and nay, but in Him was yea.

II. In preparation of the subject-matter of the World Conference we should follow the comparative method. It should be a thorough mutual study of the matters then to be considered. As an illustration of this desirable method of preparation there is to be found one fair example of the quiet mutual pursuit of the ways of peace amid the controversial confusion of the seventeenth century. In 1675, Spinola, a General of the Franciscan Order, afterwards Bishop of Neustadt, started on his travels to make an inward religious peace in Germany and Hungary. His travels only ended when eighteen years afterwards, on his way to arrange for a proposed conference, he fell ill and died. In the course of his life-long labour as "an Ambassador of the Peace of the Church" he met Molanus, a Lutheran theologian, who, also, had been seeking for the way of reconciliation. In the seclusion of the Abbey of Loccum these two, Roman Catholic and Protestant, for seven months studied together the doctrines over which the Church was divided. They did not propose a full or final plan of reunion, but they did work out a draft of rules to be observed in the prosecution of their work of union. I need not now enter into the particulars of their work, or review Molanus' private thoughts, afterwards published, concerning the several controverted doctrines on which agreement seemed to him not impossible. But the following observations of his are quite pertinent to our present undertaking. He declared that "union of the Christian Churches would easily be possible as soon as the one would not demand compliance and recantation from the other in matters of secondary importance, but would keep clearly in eye the true essence and the true end of religion, when men would

then come to understand that the parties stood nearer each other in essentials than appeared in the disputes about words." This possibility of mutual understanding and closer approach Molanus proceeded to show in reference to the principal points of doctrinal divergence. After this preliminary understanding with Molanus, Spinola started again on his travels, seeking, as he said, with the lantern of Diogenes the few theologians who were favourably disposed to the object, since it had come to pass that, through the common guilt, only those were accounted zealous teachers who persecuted to the uttermost the opposite party. He succeeded, however, in gaining support from a number of divines who found in his proposals nothing that might not be tolerated and granted in the love of peace and truth. The example of those two men, conferring seven months together in retirement, may serve at once as a rebuke and an incentive to us. Those two men, long years ago, after seven months of conference together, came at least to a Christian understanding of each other. Yet, the light in which they sought to follow the ways of peace was dim in comparison with the light of biblical and historical studies in which we may take counsel with one another. For those men their time was not ready; our times wait for the messengers of the peace of God throughout Christendom.

III. I pass to a third character of the method of preparation to be commended; it may be called, according to biological analogy, a genetic method of inquiry. That is, concerning all our varieties of Christian beliefs and institutions we are to consider how they have grown. This is not to make a mere consensus of creeds. Still less is it an accountant's work of taking an inventory of what we hold as trust-funds in our deposit of faith. Our God is the God of the living. His Church, it has been said, has become from age to age what it has in order that it might live. In what new adaptations must it continue to grow in order that it may survive? It would

require a long essay to elucidate and apply, as may be done, this biological method as a reconciling principle among our logical contradictions of doctrines and policies. Permit for the present purpose the following mere statement of some pertinent points.

So far as any idea of development has obtained in theology, it has been until lately logical rather than vital. In natural science the theory of development once generally held was that known as preformation—the chick existed already formed in the egg. That is evolution in the strict sense of the word. The now commonly received conception of evolution is that called epigenesis —the full grown body has been developed from germinal characters in vital response to environment. Formerly, and still in many quarters, our several ecclesiastical polities have been held to be preformed in the Apostolic egg, ordinals, offices, bishops, presbyteries and all. The Congregationalists and the Presbyterians formerly found their ecclesiastical patterns existing in miniature in the primitive Church. Now we all of us have to re-study and compare our several views of the organization of the Church in the light of a more scientific idea of development. This leads us directly to the point that needs to be pressed; we cannot hope to attain anything in the Church analogous to organic unity, unless we are ready to observe the law of organic development.

God is not the author of confusion between the spiritual and the natural. No Church, therefore, can either maintain for itself, or lead others into, an organic unity, and at the same time, in its view of the origin and development of Christian institutions, cling to a theory of preformation, which science has rendered obsolete in the natural world. We may realize the idea of the organic unity of the Church as we shall be ready to acknowledge the fact that it has been, and always must be, a developing Church—that it must continue always in a process of becoming, in order that it may survive. Not to enlarge

or to discuss this further, I merely would submit this as an important principle of reconciliation to be given due consideration in the preparation of the subject-matter for the World Conference.

IV. We are brought now to a fourth sign along the way, to which the other three mentioned have led up. It is the method of seeking for the vital values in religious experience of our beliefs. In all our varieties of religious life there are the real values which are to be conserved in the comprehensive Church. Through these we are made one. That I may put as plainly and directly as possible this principle of vital values in religious experience as the spiritual principle of catholicity, allow me to apply it specifically to the question on which the Church is still most deeply, as well as sincerely, divided. For over three centuries Christians have been most widely separated where the first disciples were most closely bound to one another, at the Lord's Supper. Still where we would come personally nearest together, unwillingly we find ourselves ecclesiastically farthest apart. And the pity of it all is that this separation, more perhaps than any other, goes down into principles which are held to be essential. But may we not go down deeper still into the essential grace of God to find ourselves beneath such separation? No one of us but can give ready answer for his own doctrine of the sacrament; we can use the definitive phrases which mark the distinctions between our teachings. But in our different communions we know all too little of one another, even in this one deepest, truest, most Christian experience of all. What is the real validity of the sacrament in religious experience? I would like to know, if I may, what it meant to John Henry Newman when, having given up Oxford, he found himself alone in the real presence of Christ in celebrating the mass? I would feel, if I may, what these symbols mean on the table of some simple chapel to that humble worshipper whose pure heart there has vision of God. I

want to know, if I can, what the sacrifice of the Altar is to those penitents in the elevation of the host, how they find their Saviour there offering Himself for the sin of the world. I would understand what measure of inward grace may be bestowed upon others who, all too thoughtlessly it may be, do what the Lord bade His disciples do in remembrance of Him. I know and am weary of the theses and antitheses of men's doctrines of the sacrament; would that I might more richly apprehend what the sacrament has meant in the inner experience of confessors and saints. Through these we may know the oneness of the disciples in the presence of their Lord. Would that before we shall have finished our preparation for the World Conference a few choice spirits might be found to gather from the biographies, the letters and most intimate words of many devout souls in all communions what have been to them the inestimable riches of Christ in the Eucharist and the sacrament of the Altar.

I have thus far called attention to these four guideposts along the way towards the home gathering of the scattered communions in some future catholicity. I am well aware that such preparation for so great reconciliation far exceeds the call or means of this North American Preparation Commission. Quiet but increasing influences must run their full course; the Holy Spirit of education must first open the eyes of the understanding of many in the light which now shineth, before the hopes may be fulfilled of those earlier prophets of peace and apostles of reasonableness of whom their world was not worthy. The larger and longer educational preparation among all our churches will require many individual efforts, renewed irenic studies, as well as not a few historical and critical publications. It is now much to be desired that the winnowed results of modern scholarship concerning these matters should be gathered up and presented in readable forms to the people.

In order that these methods of preparation thus

urged may not be left too much in the air, may I indicate their special application to one divisive issue which we are not as yet prepared to discuss? Outside our conferences, however, it is the first question and almost the sole issue that is raised—I refer, of course, to ordination. It will meet us finally at the World Conference. It is, therefore, quite indispensable that we should be ready then to set the question of orders in its right place and importance in relation to religious values which are primary or derivative, vital or instrumental. One trouble with us is that we come to this separation between us too far down the stream. Efforts to cross over from the one side to the other might be compared to an attempt to throw a bridge across the mouths of the Danube, over its marshes, and its many streams. We need to begin higher up to start together. We may need to go back beyond our divergent denominational streams, back through the whole course of Christian history, beyond the Apostolic beginnings of the Church, up to the Christ Himself, who is Master and Lord of the New Testament. Nay, more; we may go back through the preliminary history of the people of God to the earliest springs of heaven's grace among the hills of God, even to Melchisedec, who was without father or mother, or ecclesiastical genealogy, King of Peace, Priest of the God most High.

It is a significant fact that in the efforts for reunion in the post-Reformation age, comparatively little attention was paid to the question of ordination. I have turned page after page of the accounts of those earlier conferences and correspondence to find but three allusions to ordination. It is only a partial explanation to observe that for two or three generations the original validity of the reformers' Roman ordination may not have been considered to have lost its primal virtue. The fact which we shall do well to consider was that their controversies reached deeper down after the fundamentals and their irenics went to the core of things essential. They were mostly

concerned with what Christ meant to give in the sacrament, in what was the essence and power of redeeming grace. Both doctrinally and historically we must go below the later alluvial accretions—the washings left from past controversies;—we must sink our inquiries through the tertiary strata of the creeds down to the primeval granite, the rock on which the Church has everlasting foundations. And that is unstratified, it has crystallized simplicity. If, on the other hand, we shall merely endeavour in this coming World Conference to make a synthesis of our various confessions of faith, to fuse their words together in the heat of a passion even for unity, we shall succeed in making a conglomerate only, without inward coherence, a pudding-stone unity which a blow may break up. It will not be enough if for lack of thorough preparation our Conference should end only in a better feeling. Chaos would remain chaos still, though diffused with nebulous warmth. The Almighty did not establish the ancient order of the heavens on sentiment. In the beginning of the creation God said, "Let there be light." And when light was, the Lord proceeded to establish the firmaments, and to develop the fair, sure order of the earth. We shall need light first—light from all quarters, concentrated and focussed on the constructive work which must be done by the World Conference, if afterwards it may be called very good, and all the churches may be blessed in a Sabbath peace.

In the year 1770 a famous Abbé, who had been invited to take part with a Cardinal in an effort for Church unity, declined to do so, and in giving his reason for it he expressed the hope that hindrances which were then insuperable might disappear in the light of true philosophy, with the help of history and criticism. That light, he said, was already rising above the horizon. He added, "I speak not of mutual toleration—that is at all times possible—I speak of a true reunion." In the light of the

common scholarship of all communions the way may be found through difficulties which hitherto have kept them apart.

It devolves upon me before I end to remind you of the work which already has been well done, and of the possibilities also that open before us. In the call to the proposed conference, and subsequent declarations, it has been made plain that all communions are to meet together, for the purposes of conference, on equal footing. Thereby an initial mistake was avoided which might have rendered this conference impossible, as it did kill at its birth the early conference in 1645, to which I have referred. For then the call was first issued through the Hierarchy, and the "dissidents" would not accept an invitation which implied the superior authority of the Roman Bishop. The king, however, seeing the mistake, himself called the conference and in a noble letter put that obstacle out of the way. One sentence I may cite. It was in the twenty-sixth year of the thirty years' war, when Poland was then a little space of peace amid surrounding conflicts, that King Waldislaus wrote these words so applicable to our present situation: "It is now well known that the bloody hate of Christendom, for the pacification of which human wisdom can find no means, and which daily grows more, flows from no other source than from the disunity of religion." The dissidents met with the Catholics at the call of the king. There would be no World Conference now if the invitation should come for it with any note of assumed authority. There can be no mediation among us unless it shall be mediation by all of us. No Church since the Reformation has had power, no Church now by itself alone has mediating position or call except as all may give to it a representative voice. At the meeting here last January the several Commissions announced in unmistakable terms a declaration of the "Spiritual Basis of the World Conference." Without authority to summon the East and the West

and all communions of the Dispersion to a General Council, an invitation has gone forth to the ends of the world to unite in a general conference, as ecumenical as the Spirit of Christ may vouchsafe it to become. Upon this foundation, already so broadly and so wisely laid, we are henceforth to build our American part towards its completion.

It is not enough for our American Commissions to wait for others to take up the necessary work of preparation. It is not the service of God for us to loiter around the very throne of grace, content with offering prayers of vain repetitions for heaven's removal of our unhappy divisions. It is not faith to consider that for which the Lord prayed to be for us impossible. It is now high time for us to go forth and to find the answers to our prayers which may be already within our reach. There is in this undertaking an urgent duty for us to set our minds at work together, as well as to allow our hearts to flow together. Our forefathers would be ashamed of us if we should "take counsel of our fears, and not rather of our hopes."

It would be a pitiful conclusion if for any lack of labour or foresight this movement should fall short in some makeshift of unity from which might issue worse disunity. Some conferences and Church congresses have fallen into what may be characterized as a Noah's Ark conception of Church unity. Amid the rising flood of worldliness without, some temporary accommodation has been sought for every denomination after its kind. But so may it not be written of our assembling: Into the ark of the World Conference they enter, chosen delegates, two and two, every church in Christendom, wherein there is the breath of life; they lift up their inharmonious voices until the whole ark is filled with the sound thereof; some singing birds there are, whose notes are scarce heard at intervals of their disputations, and doves, too, waiting their hour to find some olive branch of promise. Common peril without and some temporary measures of com-

ity within may keep them, every kind in its own place, and prevent them from devouring one another. And after due season they go forth, that they may breed abundantly, and their sects be fruitful and multiply in the earth. And Noah must have been glad when they adjourned.

But never can the Church of God be satisfied with the comprehension of a Noah's Ark. There is for our great Conference a more excellent way. There is a real unity of the Church to be made visible. These words of ours are all too inadequate expressions of it—super-denominational, vital, organic, dynamic, members of one body; "body"—that was the one word which Paul found for it, the Church His body, real then as flesh and blood, visible yet transcendent, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. This spiritual possibility may be waiting when, from the whole circle of the world, believers of every name shall be met in one place;—to them there may be opened some revealing of what was in the mind of Jesus when He lifted up His eyes to heaven and, as He prayed, His hushed disciples caught from His lips the word "one," that they may be one, one as the Father and the Son are one; and the same mind that was in Jesus shall become the vision of His servants, in the presence of His glory there, and the world, looking on, may know that its Christ is made manifest in the oneness of His Church.

Prepare ye, prepare ye the way of the Lord. Let your mountains of division be laid low, and every valley of separation be filled up. For even in this generation the kingdom of God is come nigh.

A New Disposition

By Robert Johnston, D.C.L.,
Rector of the Church of the Saviour, Philadelphia.

Our age is that of a new disposition towards Unity. The old disposition, based on scholastic conclusions now being abandoned, is passing. With the newer light there is coming a larger love, and with this an evident desire for a better understanding. This change has not come suddenly. We can only realize that it has come by looking backward. The change is not that of a passing mood. It is based on scholarly conclusions which, compared with those of the past, are permanent. Fresh evidence may lead to further developments, but the movement will be forward and not backward. The evidence, we believe, will be complementary to, and not contradictory of, our present position.

Contentment in our mutual isolation was based on the findings of scholars. It apparently had justification in the facts of history and a sound philosophy of events. The apparent authority of history made it possible for a temper to develop which made even the dream of a union most difficult and prevented the dawn of a brighter day.

Bishop Mandell Creighton, the great historian of the Papacy, said that the appeal of the Church of England was, in the last resort, to sound learning. Sound learning has created the New Disposition, and herein lies the hope of its continuance. No amount of good feeling will reunite a split Church. Many men of good will cannot

see over the walls of partition. Love has come to them. But loyalty to received truth, loyalty to principles, makes improbable a Union for which the heart sighs and prays. Two laymen of the Episcopal Church, whose names are known to every American reader of the CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY, were discussing five years ago steps towards Union. Both men are profoundly religious, both men have the background of a brilliant University career, both men hold distinguished places in the national life, both are familiar with Church polity and history. As the conversation proceeded the way seemed to be opening up for an important concerted and far-reaching act. All hope was abandoned, however, when one proposed a course of conduct which seemed to violate the witness of history to a sound principle. No amount of friendship could avail on this occasion to remove the deadlock.

Every witness therefore who appears with evidence which will meet such situations is welcome to the men of the New Disposition.

Prebendary Grane [1] of Chichester has ably interpreted the signs of this new time and has brought unusual learning, a rare temper, and a sound judgment to the task. He writes, of course, from the point of view of the Church of England, and justifies the hope of its being the Apostle, if not the Church of the Reconciliation.

The New Disposition recovers at least the memory of an ideal lost among the Churches for too long a time. We come back to the aim of Christ and His Apostles. The creation of a living society bound together in unity of spirit was the original purpose. The function of the Beloved Family was to produce in its members the Christ character—St. Paul's oft reiterated "in Christ" was the one thing to be desired. This state of being "in Christ" was too soon associated with and over-laden by dogmatic tenets of a scholastic and arbitrary kind. Deissmann describes this as breaking the strings of the harp and

[1] *Church Divisions and Christianity.* Macmillan.

twisting them into a tangle which it is hopeless to unravel.[2] From the beginning it was difficult to see the necessary connection of these tenets with Christian character. The history of souls, as well as the exemptions provided for by theologians, only increased this difficulty. Later, politics drove in a wedge between the Latin and Greek Churches, and this together with difference in Church organization, rendered even more difficult the perception of the connection between these divisive things and the development of character or improvement in conduct. This absence of a connection between the object of the Church and the causes of ecclesiastical divisions is not new. Throughout Christendom the strongholds of disunion have been of a constitutional, traditional and external kind. They are not related to the inward and spiritual verities of Christ's true religion. They have come from the doubtful domain of institutional theories or from the domain of speculative theology. We have quarrelled as children; from the low ground of the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, till we meet again in anger over the awe-inspiring mystery of the Being of God. The men of the New Disposition come as commanded by the Procurator of the Holy Synod on one hand, desiring to be Orthodox—to be right in Christ; on the other hand, as commanded by the *Dublin Review* with a *Confiteor* and a *Miserere*. They come confessing the share they and their fathers had in tearing the Seamless Robe, and in humility they ask the mercy of God and man. They are ready to surrender everything that Christ did not hold dear, providing that his true religion shall have free course in the world. They are willing to forget the special interests of their part of the Church in a desire to serve the whole. Believing that the faith of Christ is most fully displayed in the manifestation of love they come to their brethren in the spirit of meekness bearing in mind also that the

[2] Cf. Deissmann's *Paul*, pp. 153–5. Hodder & Stoughton.

meek shall inherit the earth. They are committed in the Spirit of Christ to seek a path of recovery. They seek a lost unity and a lost power.

The path of recovery is plain. Three steps are pointed out. (1) Organized Christendom must be willing to acknowledge error. With the pious Roman theologian Johann Adam Mohler all must say, "We all have erred, we all have sinned," believing with him that "the open confession of a common guilt will be followed by the Festival of Reconciliation." (2) There must be a revision of values. (3) The supremacy of Christ must be more apparent in our allegiance. Thus we shall create the atmosphere favourable to Reunion which Professor Sanday tells us is necessary before Reunion can come. Prebendary Grane answers for the Church of England, and his position is fortified by an irresistible appeal to the Spirit of the New Testament as witnessed in the life of the Early Church.

Christendom has failed signally in preserving Unity, "a grace held cardinal by Christ." In making Christ's teaching the test of necessary doctrine, and the Spirit of his life the final arbiter of what is doubtful, the scandal of division cannot but end. Christ's teaching, as the Church's form of sound words, and Christ's method the Church's discipline, sum up significantly the path of recovery.

But necessity is on the men of the New Disposition to face those facts which bar the way, or make men timorous in facing it. Speaking again from the point of view of an Anglican Communion, and representing a growing number of thoughtful scholars within its bounds, we face the really serious obstacles to Christian Unity among Protestants, and Church Union between the Church of England and the Free Churches of the English speaking peoples. The Very Reverend A. A. Hotsvitzky, a Dean of the Russian Orthodox Church, said in May 1913 in New York, "I feel that the first step at this moment

towards realizing the purposes of the 'Conference on Faith and Order,' is really to embrace your Protestant Churches together."

Two practical and persistent obstacles which bar the way are the exclusion from the Eucharist of those baptized but unconfirmed, and that reading of history which makes bishops necessary to the existence of the Church.

It is here that conclusions of contemporary students come to our rescue. The refusal to admit baptized non-Episcopalians to the altar could be understood in the light of the conviction that it was a necessity imposed by the New Testament, and a loyalty provoked by allegiance to the whole Church. An examination of the various rites used in admitting to the Holy Communion in early times presents duty in a different light. No longer is it claimed to be a matter of fundamental principle as expressed in the uniform custom of the Church. The regulation is disciplinary. And in the light of the growing supremacy of Christ in our religion, the men of the New Disposition are indisposed to exclude where Christ has not excluded. In a comparative study it has been pointed out by a recent student,[3] that the "Laying on of Hands" does not occur in Syrian rites until the fifth century. Rites dating from 180 A.D. to 450 A.D. mention Anointing with Oil, Blessing of Oil, Confession of Faith, Blessing of Water, the Eucharist, Fasting, Insufflation, Kiss of Peace, but never the "Laying on of Hands." Greek and Armenian rites are found without it. In some Western rites the "Laying on of Hands" occurs twice in the Preparation, and not at all in the Initiation. In others, it occurs once in the Preparation, and once in the Initiation. Obviously then we cannot identify the present practice of Confirmation with the practice of the whole Church in past ages. Nor can

[3] The Rev. R. K. Yerkes, D.D., Professor of the History of Religions in the Philadelphia Divinity School. *The Place of Confirmation in the Christian Economy.*

we identify the rites referred to, with the practice of the New Testament.

What is true of Confirmation is true of the alleged necessity of Episcopal ordination for a valid ministry. Recently witnesses have arisen in the Church of England who testify that, in the words of Dr. Headlam, "Ordination depends upon the authority of the Church, and not the Church upon ordination." Mr. Rawlinson, Tutor of Keble College, Oxford, asserts, "We are debarred from considering the form of the Ministry as constituted and determined for all time by actual legislation proceeding from our Lord's own lips; its authority must on any view be regarded as mediated through the Church, by which, under the guidance of the promised Spirit, it was evolved. This is a point of capital importance. For what the Church has determined, the Church might conceivably alter."[4]

In keeping with the conclusions of these modern scholars, the statement of Hooker, "there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination without a bishop," assumes a new significance. Bishop Cosin's (Durham, 1660 A.D.) knowledge that English bishops did not reordain many Presbyterian ministers on being admitted to the cure of souls in England is of further help. Archbishop Ussher (Primate of Ireland 1625–1641) bears witness to his belief that *Episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine*, and adds that where bishops cannot be had "the ordination of presbyters standeth valid." The corroboration of the position assumed by men of the New Disposition by Archbishop Cranmer on the one hand, and the Roman Ordinal on the other, makes possible the removal of serious obstacles. Cranmer insists that "Bishops and Priests were not two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's Religion." The Roman Ordinal defines bishops and priests as one order. The custom of the Church

[4] *Foundations*, page 385.

of England in providing that priests assist the bishop in the laying on of hands in ordination teaches the same point. With the support of the Catechism of the Council of Trent which makes the priesthood the highest order in the ministry, and the statement of a former Archbishop of York (Maclagan) that a "bishop is a presbyter raised over his brethren for the purpose of government," we have a right to feel that the stone has been rolled away which too long has imprisoned the free course of Christ's religion in the Church, in so far as the obstacles of withholding the Holy Communion from Protestant non-Episcopalians, and the insistence on Episcopal ordination as a *sine qua non* of a valid ministry, are concerned.

Clearly then we have ground for the increase of hope; and for the spread of the New Disposition. We have grounds for the enlargement of the sphere of love, and for Christian co-operation. The Protestant Christian will no longer resent a reflection on his spiritual standing in the Beloved Community, and his baptism will not only make him one with Christ, but one with all those who are "in Christ." The rich fruits of Christian experience which have been produced by means of non-Episcopal ministries will not only be recognized, but the ministry will be largely judged by them.

We can enter into friendly discussion as to which is the more effective instrument of Church government, and whatever commends itself to the consecrated common sense of the Church, in the light of our centuries of experience, will ultimately be adopted. The theory of the Papacy, which has supplanted Episcopal rule, will receive thoughtful and even kindly consideration. Realizing that no system as at present constituted received its authority before or during the great Forty Days, the fear of disloyalty to our Lord or the Catholic Church disappears.

There seems to be no doubt that the position assumed by those of the New Disposition is historically accurate.

Accumulating evidence seems to confirm rather than weaken the position herein assumed. Historical truth must always be the foundation of the religious edifice. In so building we are not building on sand but on the rock of truth which though it may sometimes be hidden by overgrowth, will always stand.

Yet, far beneath the surface, the source of our present evil of disunity lies hidden. Our perspective is out of line, and our values are wrong. The distinction drawn by Prebendary Grane between "gospel" and "ecclesiastical" values is a real one. The Gospel dwells on the Love of God, the Church too long has meditated on the Omnipotence of God. Philosophy has divided; and Love has had no chance to unite. Concerning ecclesiastical values many are urging that "the teachings of the Church are fast ceasing to exert a living influence." Men like the Bishop of Carlisle are discriminating between "the true catholicity of Christ, and the false catholicity of the Churches." The issue threatens to be joined between "the basis of the Catholic Creed and system" and the "primary facts of Christianity." The painful fact, that still, after twenty centuries of Christianity, two-thirds of the human race are still outside Christianity, is being thrust forward as evidence against the Church. The condition of society in Christian England is given as adequate reason, by native writers, why India should hesitate to accept a religion which has done so little for the people who profess it. With deliberation Christian men are saying that "the scholastic system is bankrupt and that its conclusions, except where otherwise confirmed, are discredited."

Wherein lies the cure? Boldly it is stated that "the regeneration of the world awaits the regeneration of the Church." The way of regeneration is plain. First of all in the Way of Life. Jesus never speculated concerning God. He tells us nothing of His omnipotence. He throws no light to disentangle our philosophies. He de-

clares the Father to be Love. The Way of Life is the Way of Love, Christians must learn again to love one another. To despise a fellow Christian is not to despise man, but God. The disciples found their faith strained when Jesus said "Seventy times seven," and pleaded "Lord, increase our faith." Christians in our day find their wills subjected to great stress in the face of the unqualified command, "Love your enemies." In obeying this command we begin to live.

The royal road to the Way of Life is found in a life which, like that of Jesus, can be described as expressing "the love and kindness of God our Saviour toward men appearing." So elementary is this, so fundamental, that the *Metanoia* of the Church will find its highest expression in recovering the picture seen by observers of the early Christians, "See how these Christians love one another," and translating it once again into fact. Contending for the faith once for all delivered to the Saints, means nothing more than striving for the faith of Jesus. The faith of Jesus was expressed manward and Godward. With the adulteress before him, caught red-handed, he never lost faith in poor sinful humanity. In the face of sin, sorrow, want and death, his faith in God never wavered. Witness his "Not a sparrow falleth to the ground without your Heavenly Father's knowledge." The cries of the persecuted in the past, the smoke of the fire-burning heretics, are heard and seen even today and can only be drowned in the sea of love.

Secondly, in the Way of Thought. Our direction is clearly pointed out. A thoughtful layman[5] whose words have been greatly welcomed on many sides, jars us not a little when he speaks of the confusion of Christ's thought and teaching by "second class philosophers" of a venerated age. Yet another has declared that Christ "has been impotent for centuries." [6] Again the issue is joined.

[5] Donald Hankey, see *The Lord of All Good Life.*
[6] Neville Talbot in *Foundations,* page 281.

It is betwixt Christ and the Christian philosophers. Against their conclusions there is being put the "Whatsoever He saith" of the gospels. Believing that the Spirit has yet much of Christ to reveal, the man of the New Disposition searches for the new knowledge of Christ which awaits the humble, patient and loving seeker. So "discipleship will begin to count for more than organization; and the creedal records of ancient intellectual war, handled according to the spirit and not according to the letter, will furnish terms of fellowship, instead of weapons of exclusion."

The spirit of these words is widespread. In a most valuable book it is stated, "the creed is primarily an expression of allegiance to Jesus Christ," again, "the creed in worship is not a mere utterance of abstract doctrines. It is the badge of allegiance to Christ, a common allegiance expressing a common passion and a common purpose." [7]

Here is a new form of the much worn "Back to Christ." It acknowledges his supreme authority. Before him all things must bow in thought and action, in heaven and earth. Those who travel in Jesus' Way of Life and are illumined in His Way of Thought are changed from glory unto glory. But there is no mere life of reflection ahead. Those who believe that there is new knowledge of Christ to be attained, believe also that there are new works waiting to be undertaken in his wonderful name. They have faith in Christ's words: "Greater works than these will ye do." But one thing is clear, "The Way and the Guide along the Way can never be divorced." On the Way are marching pilgrim brothers, bound together in a common purpose, and led by an unerring Guide. The common ground, the common purpose, the common leader, inspire men of the New Disposition. In him, they see all things anew.

---

[7] Dr. Drown, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass., *The Apostles' Creed Today.*

Mysticism and Unity

By John Derwent Llwyd, D.D., D.C.L.,
Dean of Nova Scotia.

"Have you met C——," was the question asked by a clerical friend in Southsea during my stay in England a few years ago? We had been discussing sermons and preachers.

In response to my negative he went on, "C—— is wonderful, *sui generis*, a nonpareil. He lectures every Sunday evening during the season to about twenty-five of the best known people in London, judges, authors, professors. You must have a card of invitation to get in; the house in ———— belongs to one of his followers. There is the lecture at 6.30, then supper and social chat for the evening. When my spiritual reservoirs go dry, I go up to London and hear C——. He recharges the batteries and I run on for a while longer. Yes, you can get to know him. I will write for a card to his next Sunday's lecture."

Sunday evening came, and on presenting the card at the address named, I was ushered into a drawing room occupied by a small circle of people. On a dais at the end was a smooth-shaven man of about sixty-five, ruddy in feature, and dressed like a clergyman. He had just begun to speak, though without rising from his seat. He was giving an exposition of St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians. For forty-five minutes he poured forth a stream of rich and elevated thought, clothed in diction chaste, concise, imaginative, powerful. He did not appear to refer to notes; it was a species of rhapsody; a

speaking with tongues which was yet intelligible to the understanding; a prophecy.

Later in our acquaintance his history was told by friends. He was a priest of the Anglican Church, an Oxford man of high standing, a contemporary and friend of Liddon and the later Tractarians. His talents and convictions had made him the hope of the High Churchmen of the university. He became rector of S——, a large parish with a considerable staff of clergy, working there with success for ten years. Becoming dissatisfied with his religious position, he went into retirement and finally organized a monastic brotherhood without vows for the pursuit of the contemplative life, supporting it by his own private means. He began to study the writings of the great mystics, learning to believe at length that mysticism held the key to that more intimate union with God of which he was in search. At last he renounced monastic ways; married; and resolved to devote himself to an apostleship of mystical teaching, organizing a small circle of friends and imbuing them with the opinions upon life and God and the soul which had impressed himself. Without breaking away from the Church or from the external side of Anglican religion, the education of this handful of students became his special vocation—a vocation through which English religion and English character were slowly to be leavened. Already he had done much. One of his disciples had become the most famous preacher in England. He was anticipating an hour when mysticism should have unified Christendom from within, through the church's entrance upon an immediate consciousness of God, in whose union and enjoyment the ravished believers would realize their oneness and forget the barriers of dogma, ceremony, and prejudice set up by antiquity to divide them. I could not help seeing in C—— and his group of followers an exemplification of certain forces which move all down the field of church history. Content to keep in the

background of progress, rarely attempting any such propaganda as brings a sect or a leader into prominence, it is mainly in moments when the veil of history parts asunder that these actors behind the scenes of the church drama can be discerned at work. Their influence has been in the inverse ratio of their self-advertisement. In them, as ever, quality has triumphed over quantity; intensity over magnitude and dimension. They are examples of the law that silent forces are the real powers, and that the mightiest of these silent powers is just *Life*, *Spiritual Life*.

What is Mysticism, this thing of quietness and confidence, and yet of strength? Definitions are dangerous things, they often recall Punch's famous definition of dogma as an opinion laid down with a snarl. To define is to generalize, but it is not easy to give a comprehensive name to the individual films in the moving picture of mysticism. Mysticism is a spirit as well as a movement in Christian history. In the first sense it is that state of exalted devotion into which every new birth of spiritual life introduces us; a fruitful cause of good to Christendom; fusing in the white heat of devotion many of the steel bulkheads which divide the ship of the church into watertight compartments. As a historical movement, it is less easy of analysis. However, just as in the higher calculus, results may be reached by approximations rather than by exactitudes, so here our hope must be to reach a working definition rather than a perfect one. Lehmann has perhaps reached this in his saying that the kernel of the difference between Christianity and mysticism is the difference between *Fellowship* and *Union*.

Mysticism, then, will be that aspect of religion whose object is immediate union with God, whose conception of union is absorption rather than fellowship, and whose pathway of attainment lies through contemplation, asceticism, or ecstasy. Let us look at this a little more closely.

Some thinker—the poet Coleridge, I believe—has remarked that all human beings are either Platonists or Aristotelians. Consciously or unconsciously the work of thinking is done by human beings on one or other of the lines laid down by those two pioneer thinkers of Greece. A similar broad classification of religious phenomena might be attempted into Subjective and Objective; the modes of approach to the Divine which emphasize the inward experiences of the spirit, and those whose stress is chiefly laid upon instrumentalities or revelations external to the believer. These are the two poles of religion, with belts of more temperate climate along the spiritual equator where the better elements of each fall into harmony. One of them has for its extreme Fetichism, where the symbol ceases to be a symbol and becomes itself the object of worship; the other extreme is Pantheism, where the distinction between the One and the Many is lost, and the One remains the only final form of existence.

Careful students of religious history will agree that the theological conflicts of the ages are at bottom conflicts between these rival points of view. Protestantism has been a battle for the subjective side of Christianity: Roman Catholicism a striving for its objective aspect: and only today are we growing to understand the possibility of a Neo-Catholicism (to quote Dr. Newman Smyth's word) which shall be a synthesis of the two.

Mysticism belongs in the Subjective category. Two points characterize it; the conception of union with the Deity, and the methods by which such a union is brought to pass.

The conception of union held by the mystics of all ages is not the commingling of minds and hearts known as fellowship, and illustrated so finely in Abraham's friendship with God, or in the close, personal relation between the disciples and the Master; it is rather the union of absorption, in which the lesser nature merges and is lost in the higher.

The Persian apologue of the Sufis is a familiar illustration. "Once a lover went and knocked at his beloved's door. 'Who is there,' was asked. 'It is I,' said the lover. The voice spake back soft and low: 'There is not room in this house for me and thee.' Then the lover went away and prayed and fasted in solitude. A year passed away and he came and knocked again, and again the voice spake, 'Who is there?' 'Oh love,' he answered, 'it is thyself,' and the door was opened unto him." Absorption does not always show itself in an extreme form: there are Christian mystics like St. Bernard and St. Teresa in whom the sacred fire has not wholly consumed the sense of individuality, yet mysticism considered in the large undoubtedly tends in that direction. The dervish spinning in his circle; the medicine man in his dance; the votary of Attis and Dionysus in his orgiastic festival; the initiate in the mysteries of Eleusis or of Sabazius; agree with the followers of Plotinus, or the students of Dionysius the Areopagite, and even with the followers of George Fox in seeking a mental exaltation in which the human consciousness practically merges in the Divine. The conception of Deity may differ; the degree of absorption may vary; but the essential idea is the same; union is regarded as involving identity of nature rather than of sympathy. Ample proof of these statements is furnished by a brief review of the history of the cult. It is absent from the New Testament. Holtzmann's question, "Was Jesus an Ecstatic," for which he marshals with much labour every proof enabling him to answer, "Yes," has been replied to in the negative by Loisy, who points out in the *Critical Review* that the marks of genuine ecstasy are absent in Christ, *e.g.*, unconsciousness or the unmanning of the man; and that the enthusiasm of Christ and His apostles is always sane. The triplet, Asceticism, Ecstasy, Intuition, says Lehmann, has no root in the gospel. Its first real appearance in the Christian era is with Gnos-

ticism at the point where Platonism began to be absorbed into Christianity. The root distinction between Platonism and Christianity is that in the first redemption is through Knowledge, in the second, through Faith. This distinction is not only Platonic in contrast to Christian, it is Greek in contrast to Jewish, and Aryan in contrast to Semitic. Dean Inge of St. Paul's has pointed out that St. John uses the verb "γιγνώσκω, I know;" but never the noun "γνῶσις, knowledge," as if to guard against confusion with Gnostic ideas. Philo shows that influence. "The inspired man, He upon whom God has in truth poured out His breath, can with good reason call himself God." Clement of Alexandria speaks of "γνῶσις, knowledge," as scientific faith, and makes "purification" the path to it: Origen holds similar opinions; indeed these two writers reveal the profound difference between the East and the West. In the East all development consists in demonstration; in the West it consists in regeneration. In the first a tradition is given whose content must be unfolded but not varied from or reinterpreted; in the West the tradition is the same but is susceptible of unceasing renewal by Life. The influence of mystical thought came to a head in the Eastern Church in the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius, when it is taught that God is above all Threeness and Oneness. His doctrine of union runs as follows: "All thinking and perception given up, all that can be perceived and thought, all that is and is not, in ignorance man ascends to the Unity which exists above all Being and Knowledge. There he plunges into the mystic Darkness and Unconsciousness, where all known distinctions vanish, then is he one with the perfectly Unknowable, and through unity with the Unknowable he becomes like God, θεοείδης." So much for the East.

In the West Augustine's Confessions contain traces of this view, but perhaps a clearer expression is reached in the love-mysticism of Francis of Assisi, the saint of the

stigmata, as it overflows in the poetry of the singer, Jacopone dei Todi:

> Love, Love, beloved Jesus:
> Love, I will die embracing thee.
> Sweet Love, Jesus my Bridegroom:
> Love, Love, Jesus thou Best one
> Give me Thyself; transformed into Thee
> Think, that I would be beside myself
> Knowing nothing of myself:
> Jesus my Hope,
> Come now, slumber in Love.

Following in his steps came Molinos, of whom Shorthouse paints so noble a portrait in his novel, *John Inglesant.* His doctrines would have led to the formation of a school in the Church of Rome where every member might be permitted to realize the Highest through direct communion apart from confession or priest. At first popular, the Jesuits ultimately crushed him. His farewell to Inglesant breathes the passion of quietness: "Adieu, Cavaliere; we shall meet again one day, when the veil shall be taken away from the face of God and we shall see Him as He is." The golden chain of rare, unworldly souls embraces also the mystics of France, Mme. Guyon and her sister spirit, Mme. de Chantal, whose lovely parable of the pillar must be quoted: "Could the pillar in its grotto speak and should one ask it, 'Why movest thou not?' 'Because my Lord and Master wills that I stay motionless.' 'To what servest thou here?' 'I exist only to obey the will of my Lord.' 'But thou seest Him not?' 'No, but He sees me, and joys that I stay where He set me.' 'Wouldst thou not rather have power to move nearer to Him?' 'No, not without His command.' 'Hast thou no wish then?' 'No, for I stand where my Lord and Master has placed me. His good pleasure in me is the only thing that rejoices my soul.' "

In Germany Mysticism is supported by three great names, Eckhart, Suso, Tauler. Eckhart's language is bold for the year 1327: "Is God in all things, even in the water we drink, then grace must be everywhere in

Nature. What need then of priestly mediation and of sacramental apparatus?" He had got at the inference drawn long before him by Persian and Hindoo thinkers: "Why wander longer on the way of deeds, when we have reached the way of knowledge? Why letter and messenger when I rest already on the Sultan's breast?" Tauler, who had been taught by that interesting society, the Friends of God, and who was also a man of practical sense, gave a beautiful setting to the idea: "We are created and called to great things, therefore we must give God room within us that we may bring them to pass." The tradition runs on through those exquisite words of Thomas à Kempis: "There are four things which bring much peace: Seek rather to do another's will than thine own. Wish rather for little than much. Choose rather the lowest than the highest place. Pray always that God's will may be done in thee and through thee." Then came the group of Spanish mystics, with St Teresa as their leader, equal to Catharine of Siena in practical genius but greater in depth of soul. Curiously enough her psychology placed the seat of personality in the will as Prussia does today, but with what a different result.

One variety of mysticism, the intellectual, appears chiefly in times of transition and theological flux. The religious formula has been found wearisome and hearts are throbbing with the hope of a future free from the storm of controversy and yet secure with Truth. A certain phase of this leads straight to the Modernism which treats the facts of Historical Christianity as—

> Huge cloudy symbols of a high romance—

or parables only of a Higher Truth eternal in the heavens. He who aims to reach truth by direct intuition, however, will fail to gain popularity. He is too aloof from the people, too far in the upper air, too remote from the average mental life of man, for the rank and file to follow him. Hence Mysticism reveals itself among the less intellectual

classes mainly in the form of exalted feeling and emotion. God is interpreted as the Infinite Beauty and Love; the soul's yearning is for complete oneness with that Beauty through enthusiasm and excitement. The experiences of such men as St. Bernard and St. Bonaventura; the visions of St. Hildegard and St. Teresa; the ecstasies of nuns and anchorites in mediaeval days have a parallel among us in the wonderful conversions of early Salvationism and a host of corresponding experiences throughout Christendom. The Russian and Greek Orthodox Churches are bearing even now an abundance of such fruit, for example, the monks of Athos, and the Saints of the Lavrys or Monasteries of Slavic Christianity. Tolstoi, through a rebel against church authority, approached the same position in his insistence upon the intuition of the Divine.

A further characteristic of Mysticism is that it is a religion of the small group. Propaganda, if any exists, is mainly through the influence of a few friends forming a tiny circle with little or no organization, and extending almost without conscious effort. The Brethren of the Common Life, and the Quakers of our own day are cases in point. It is to the honour of the latter that they have been a power for good in civilization out of all proportion to their numbers.

When, therefore, we come to that which is the first object of this paper, viz., the place of Mysticism in the movement towards Christian Unity, our attitude can only be one of qualified assent. Certain facts in the life of Christendom seem to point towards the helpfulness of this form of religious experience, while others point as clearly in the opposite direction.

(1) The first of the helpful signs is the fact that our age is one of transition, and that Mysticism is a natural product of such periods. The new view of the universe which came in with Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton; the prevalence of the theory of evolution; the widening

of men's horizon through discovery and invention; the application to the Bible of the sciences of historical criticism and of comparative religion have shaken Christendom out of the shackles of tradition and are compelling a restatement of many cherished beliefs. The Church will weather this tempest as she has weathered so many others in the might of the Personality Who dominates all storms with the words "Peace be still." From one viewpoint the sky is full of promise. Forces once outside are clamouring for recognition within. The day of the dualism which we inherited from the Middle Ages is past. The whole of life has begun to feel the effect of religion. Hence the existence of what is known as Christianity outside the Church. The whole of life is also affecting the Church for good. So long, however, as theology is in confusion, unable to digest and assimilate the New Learning, so long will the non-theological mind, lay and clerical, seek to pass behind the strife and controversy, and to find in mystical experiences what appears to be a certain and immediate conviction of the reality of God and Truth. Here, I think, lies one of the reasons for its renascence among us. We are dwelling in a situation akin to that illustrated in India by the history of the Brahma-Samaj, the life-work of Devendra Nath Tagore, and of his son, the mystical poet, Rabindra Nath Tagore. The mythology of Brahmanism has fallen away from their minds—"the deity of the ruined temple remains unworshipped in deathless neglect." From outworn institutions the spirit flies to the universal Soul in such words as these:

"What divine drink wouldst thou have, my God, from this overflowing cup of my life?"

"My poet, is it thy delight to see thy creation through my eyes and to stand at the portals of my ears silently to listen to thine own eternal harmony?"

"Thy word is bearing words in my mind and thy joy is adding music to them. Thou givest thyself to me in

love and then feelest thine own entire sweetness in me."

So in the welter of intellectual confusion many among us who regard faith as the pearl of great price not to be sacrificed for the paste jewels of negation and denial, seek for a Christianity which stands apart from institutions and introduces the spirit into the silence of the Eternal Presence where Truth is known because it is felt.

What the Church of the future is to be is still on the knees of Providence. Is it to be a synthesis of all types now existing, according to the dream of some? Undoubtedly there is something precious and worth preserving in the distinctive features of each form of Christian creed and social fellowship, a something which ought not to be lost. The struggles and heroisms of Christian history were not mere shadow fights; nor mere tilting at windmills; realities were at stake, and the substance of those realities will be required for the building of the perfect temple to come.

Or is the future Church to be arrived at through the predominance of one powerful type, asserting itself in harmony with the law of the survival of the fittest—as the normal and final system—by reason of its power to include the best in every lesser system? May we interpret it to the imagination under the figure of a vigorous young oak growing amidst ancient ruins, threading its boughs among the nicks and crevices of the stones, and through the broken windows of this decaying structure, until the whole ruin is a mass of foliage, and destruction has been swallowed up in the flood of green life? The wisest answer to such questions is a confession of ignorance. We do not know. This whole movement towards unity between the Churches is in the hands of a Higher Guidance than ours: many forces are combining to produce it; it may be something new and undreamt of is in store for us.

Our little systems have their day,
They have their day and cease to be.
They are but broken lights of Thee
And Thou, O God, art more than They.

The really significant fact to look at is the steady emergence into the foreground of the things that are fundamental, and the drift towards the disregard or reinterpretation of non-essential facts for which our fathers would have bled and died. There gains ground every day the conviction that among these fundamentals one of the most important values is that of Christian experience. The demonstration of the Spirit is thrusting into second place the appeal to history and to logic. A new apologetic is being framed, based on the appeal to life. The Church states its great argument nowadays in Pauline phrase: "It pleased God to reveal His Son in me." For the cumbersome apparatus of scholasticism is being substituted the simpler pragmatism which accords with our age's genius. Truth is tested by its working value, just as life vindicates its presence everywhere by manifesting the phenomena of life. It is here that religious life strikes a keynote that chimes with Mysticism. Later, we shall see the defects of this standpoint; for the present it suffices to point to the noble services it is rendering unto the cause of union. It emphasizes the fact that Christianity is fundamentally an experience with God, and that all institutionalism is worthless unless it leads man to a genuine spiritual life, a commingling of heart and soul with the Divine. I do not mean that the grand outlines of the Christian Church as it was sculptured by the hands of Christ and his apostles are destined to alter in the stream of progress; but only such conceptions and human interpretations of those outlines as have risen and flourished and then mysteriously changed under pressure from a hidden impulse of life within. The teaching of the mystic that there is a secret Light that lighteth every man has surely had its effect in preparing

the Church for that modification of institutional forms which must always come from the reaction of religious earnestness upon its environment.

(2) A further contribution to unity on the part of Mysticism lies in its emphasis upon that of which mention has already been made, the value of the group as an agent of reform. This is not part of any intended programme, it is rather an inevitable outcome of the solitude of the mystic, and of the fact that his way of thought and life are such as only to command the adhesion of a few elect souls. But it is none the less an element of strength. The small community of intense life has again and again exemplified its influence in history. Little circles of Greek scholars driven out of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, carrying with them the ancient manuscripts, and settling at Bologna, Padua, Paris, Oxford and elsewhere, broke the chain of slavery to scholastic philosophy, poured the fresh current of classic knowledge into the mind of Europe, influenced the sixteenth century with Renaissance ideas, and made the task of the Reformation thrice easier than otherwise could have been. The philosophy which gave birth to the French Revolution spread from small centres; so likewise did the Romantic movement of literature in England as with the Lake poets, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey; so again in times nearer to our own has Labour found its freedom through small unions in town and village, while Christian Socialism has covered the Anglo-Saxon world with small coteries of students. There is more hope in the little conferences upon Christian unity suggested by the World Conference on Faith and Order than in many bolder and more ambitious schemes. I would not decry or lightly esteem any effort in that direction, whether in the way of corporate reunion or federation, or interdenominational comity, or the segregation of territory in the missionary field. All are helpful, in their failures no less than in their successes, for the movement has

only just reached the educational stage, but one thing is certain, that the planting of such centres throughout the civilized world must stimulate good understanding and foster sympathy. For before we can comprehend each other's theology, we must have come together as men: so to rid ourselves of the ingrained prejudice and indifference built into our mental selves by a long ancestry of theological difference. To distinguish between the truth and error in a brother's thinking, it is not enough to know his position, I must know him; and vice versa, he must know me or men who feel as I feel and think as I think. Temperament is at the root of most forms of division.

The positive contributions of mystical modes of thought and living to Church unity are these: Emphasis on Christianity as an experience with Christ the equivalent of God; emphasis upon the unfolding of one form of Christian life into another and a higher, the spirit being superior to the form; emphasis also upon the importance of small circles in the training of an age in the appreciation of progressive movements from within itself. From these points of view Mysticism may be regarded as a partial solvent of formula and organization, unifying men upon the basis of a common experience. Such a viewpoint is of great value, especially in times of transition and during the reconstruction period which must ultimately come. For then any aspect of thought which emphasizes the soul of religion as trust, dependence, love, will aid man in preserving a calm and tranquil spirit in face of doubt. *I have felt God, therefore I know.*

Mysticism, however, can never be a complete Eirenicon for our splintered and shattered Christendom. Such a hope is a delusion. Even in the brief exposition here attempted the limitations of the theory must have become apparent; yet before closing this paper a brief glance at the negative aspect will be necessary. Mysticism fails in relation to the Church; to the Deity; to man; and to history.

(1) The Church. Religion has its organic side. The experience of the individual in conversion, in faith, in sanctification, in vision, cannot be enjoyed *in vacuo*, it depends in part upon the environment supplied by the Church of God. Bible, Sacrament, worship, church architecture and ceremonial, of whatever kind these latter may be are the environment of holiness, and provide the individual believer with food from the Christ without for the Christ within. No cult which ignores the value of the Church of Christ can ever be a complete power for the unification of that Church. This age needs not less churchmanship but more, and of a more spiritual quality. If Christianity is an experience, it is also a collective experience, the building together of innumerable souls into the Temple of redeemed humanity. The corporate life helps to feed and to inspire the life of each unit, furnishing that unit also with opportunities of service whereby his life may add its contribution to the whole. In this day we speak much of the solidarity of mankind. The personality of each one of us realizes itself through service to his fellows, like the motto on the sword of Athos in the *Three Musketeers*, "All for one and one for all." Mysticism is weak here. It bids man rest in personal communion instead of treating that as the starting point for a venture of faith on behalf of the salvation of his brethren. Moreover, by its exaggeration of rapture and ecstasy, it tends to weaken the hold even of individual religion upon many. The hard-headed, practical man who rarely experiences such exaltations, comes to regard religion as the privilege of a few highly organized souls whose temperaments and whose susceptible nervous systems make them psychic to the Divine.

(2) But Mysticism cannot be an Eirenicon for the divisions of Christianity on a second ground, the defects in its doctrine of God. On the philosophical side, as in the case of Plotinus, the Neo-Platonists, and the Pseudo-Areopagite, it so exaggerates the transcendence of God,

His superiority to all our conceptions and doctrines of Him, as to leave Him practically outside the grasp of the human mind altogether, either reducing Him to a mere nothing without qualities, or rendering necessary a series of gradations through which His approach to man becomes possible. On the emotional side Mysticism errs in the direction of Pantheism. Groping after a union which is really absorption, it tends to blur distinctions which are vital to all true religion, the distinction between God and man, between spirit and matter, between good and evil, and between subject and object. The thought of R. J. Campbell before his recent change of faith is full of illustrations of this. His volume on "A Faith for Today," identifies the human and the Divine; and regards God as the Author of evil; a view probably intended by the writer in a semi-orthodox sense, but which might be carried to serious lengths by some more logical and consistent followers. Such views touch the frontiers of immorality, witness the history of the Gnostic sects which held them in the second century. The true doctrine of God emphasizes his transcendence without denying that He can be known; it believes in a *unio mystica* between Him and man without any sacrifice of the distinctions of either; its union is not absorption, but fellowship, in which the greater nature enfolds, penetrates, and exalts the lower; not to the impairment but to the heightening and perfecting of every faculty, talent, and power, that makes man a person. Systems which exaggerate either of these elements at the expense of the other can only fail to furnish a real basis of truth for union.

(3) So also is it as regards Mysticism's doctrine of man. That doctrine assumes the possibility of union between man and the Absolute apart from the mediatorial work of Christ. St. Paul's text would then read not "Through Him," but "through our own consciousness we have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Scripture says

through *Christ*, and St. Paul is here sustained in his teaching by the express words of the Truth itself: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." The principle of mediation with respect to religion finds illustration all through life. The gifts of life, knowledge, education, refinement, physical competency, are mediated to us through others or through society and civilization. Maroon a babe on some island in the tropic seas, and if it grows up at all it will probably grow up half-idiotic. As the man is so is his debt to a myriad agencies of mediation on which he has depended for the unfolding of his powers. No system which ignores this law of life can aspire to lead us towards a unity whose very condition is that it be brought into existence through a mediatorial Church.

(4) I might criticize Mysticism also as regards man on the score of intellectual weakness, lack of clear thinking, and other sins against normal mental life, but I pass on to my last point, which is that Mysticism lacks reverence for history. Pure Subjectivism can never have adequate respect for the collective past of mankind. The experiences of each man become a law unto himself, they need no checking by the experience of bygone ages. His own thought, his own visions, his own ecstasies suffice him. Hence may spring a towering pride, whose subtle intoxication sets the individual apart in a Paradise of sweets and perfumes into which none else may enter. But in the treatment of Christian union, history is indispensable, for "history is Philosophy teaching by example." The record of our Christian past is a mine of wisdom and of warning. To shut oneself up in the prison of subjective impressions and excitements, in blindness to that great life which lies behind us, is to make necessary in each man's career the recapitulation of all former experience that he may gain the wisdom requisite for the conduct of life. If such folly is absurd in lesser con-

cerns, how monumental in absurdity does it appear when dealing with a world-wide movement like unity, whose evolution runs far into the past, and whose roots are intertwined so closely with the unfolding of our whole civilization.

In fine, the mystic can teach us the value of the soul's personal converse with Christ, the value of the element of progress in faith, and the value of small centres as the nuclei of progress. In all these he makes distinct contributions to the great cause of the unification of the Christian Church. But he cannot teach us the value of corporate religion, nor the proportion of the faith as touching God, nor the value of the mediatorial work of Christ, nor the wisdom of a proper attitude towards that wonderful past of the church, which amidst all its errors and blunders and even its crimes, shows everywhere the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and teems with witnessings of Providence.

Sacramental and Non-Sacramental Christianity

By Rayner Winterbotham,
Hon. Canon of St. Mary's, Edinburgh.

Every good Christian must regard the divisions of Christendom with profound grief, and with a great desire that they might be healed. As a rule, however, he does not see in the least where the remedy lies: or, if he fancies that he does, the measures which he applauds rather add to the confusion than otherwise. Anyhow, the first necessity is to get a clear view of the situation. And this view must not only be clear; it must be sympathetic. If anyone will take stock of the ordinary "ecclesiastical" histories put forth for the benefit of theological students, he will see at once why they are so unconvincing, so unpopular. They lack the element of sympathy. In dealing e. g. with the Montanists of the second century, or with the Anabaptists of the sixteenth, instead of dwelling upon the very much that was true and admirable in these movements—instead of making the most of St. Perpetua, and of Johann Denk—they content themselves with repeating ancient invectives, unfair and one-sided judgments passed upon them by their enemies. It does not occur to them that what made these, and other such religious movements so formidable was their *truth*—exaggerated, no doubt, and forced into disproportion, but still gospel truth which claimed and held the ardent devotion of many noble souls. Lack of sympathy—sympathy with those that lost as well as with those that won—has been the bane of ecclesiastical history.

Not otherwise is it with the great cause of Christian reunion. *He* can pray best for it; *he* can work best for

it; who has not only a clear vision of the separated elements, but also a profound and intelligent sympathy with each and all of them, with their narrowness as well as their breadth, with their exaggeration as well as their moderation, so long as any Christian truth and loyalty underlies these things.

There is one division of the Christian host, cutting it clean asunder, which seems to me to call for sympathetic treatment more than any other, because it lies deeper, and because it is a cross-division not corresponding to any of the recognized delimitations of the religious world. It is the deep-down distinction between sacramental and non-sacramental Christianity. I shall not waste time in describing them: they may be studied in the faith and practice of the Orthodox (Eastern) Church on the one hand, and of the Quakers on the other. It is, however, necessary to point out that a multitude of Anglicans, of Lutherans, and many others, are essentially non-sacramental. They may have been—probably were—baptized in infancy: but they attach no "sacramental" value to it; they would not have submitted to baptism as adults; they are not communicants; they are quite content with their religious standing, although they may be discontented with their moral attainment. The vast majority of the male adherents of the Established Church in England are of this number, in spite of the strongly-marked "sacramentalism" of the English Prayer Book.

It is not difficult to see how this attitude commends itself to earnest and thoughtful souls, as well as to the indifferent and the slothful. The English Prayer Book e. g. affirms that the two (great) sacraments are "generally necessary to salvation." It is urged (apparently with justice) that, when these words were first printed, "generally" meant what we now understand by "universally." But Elizabeth Fry (to take one example out of many) was neither baptized, nor at any time a communicant: and *she* spent her days in visiting loathsome dungeons and bringing home to their miserable inmates some sense

of Christian pity and charity. She did this, for the love of God, when nobody else did it. Did she then go to perdition when she died—unbaptized? Hardly any Christian will say "yes." Almost everyone, remembering the Master's words "by their fruits ye shall know them," remembering also the (so-called) parable of the Sheep and the Goats, will have some *unofficial* theory which will allow him to place Elizabeth Fry among the saved. But then her case, like the case of the penitent robber, draws after it an innumerable multitude of other like cases. If indeed all those who "love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness" are within the fellowship of "grace," it does not seem possible to exclude a large contingent of those who hold a distinctly non-sacramental form of religion. Anything like a sympathetic endeavour to place oneself at their standpoint will lead to the conviction that this standpoint of theirs is not only commended by their faith and practice, but is also supported by numerous testimonies of Scripture which cannot be explained away. If it be true that many passages of the New Testament prescribe or exact the use of sacraments; why, it is equally true that many others ignore them, and lay the whole stress elsewhere.

At the same time it is true that this conclusion, thus happily forced upon us by the *facts*, puts a great additional difficulty in the way of constructive work for reunion. If Christendom is ever to be re-united it must be on some basis, and that basis must surely be historical; and historical Christianity was unquestionably sacramental. You cannot really set up a purely subjective test of discipleship: the effort has been frequently made, only to end in obvious failure. The more your subjective test admits on one side, the more it excludes on the other. And yet it would seem as if any "historical" test—which is bound to be in some sort sacramental—would necessarily shut out a multitude of non-sacramental Christians, many of whom are wonderfully faithful to our Lord, and doubtless very dear to Him. Just as every eclipse has its penumbra which both is and is not a part of the

eclipse (of the "shadow cast by turning" of a heavenly body), so the Church of Christ is defined and limited by certain outward things such as baptism and communion, but is surrounded and (in a true sense) continued by a multitude of souls which are non-sacramentally united to Christ. It may be said that such a position is illogical and impracticable. Let us, however, consider that in many things it is not possible to be logical or "definite" with due loyalty to Scripture and to the facts of Christian experience. Scripture e. g. teaches salvation by faith: no doubt about that. But it also teaches salvation by works (i. e. of Christian love), and yet again salvation by sacramental incorporation in Christ. It is quite easy in theory (and very common) to hold to the one and despise the other: in practice they are found united without any difficulty. So it is easy for us to show from the Scripture that Christianity is sacramental, that from the first men sought and found touch with the Son of God through believing use of certain outward means of grace. It is equally easy for those others to show that Christianity is essentially non-sacramental, because it was made to consist in certain dispositions of the soul, and of the conduct which is prompted by such dispositions, and because experience proves that such conduct is found in fact (and at its best too) quite apart from sacraments. Both contentions seem to be honest and well founded.

It has always seemed to me that this curiously double aspect of Christ's religion is very beautifully reflected in two of His shortest and most "intimate" parables which lie together, like twins in one cradle, in S. Matthew 13—those of the Pearl and of the Treasure. I take for granted that these represent the same thing, and that in the ultimate truth of it this Thing is nothing else, nothing less, than the Lord Jesus Himself. To have Him is to have the Life, the eternal and celestial Life for which we look. To have Him is to become possessed at once *by* and *of* Him: to make Him ours forever: and that (as the parables declare) at the cost (if necessary) of all things else—friends,

relatives, possessions, earthly life itself. Granted this much, then it is easy to see that the two parables run entirely on all fours with one another—except in one well marked particular. The Pearl was *there*, on hand, for sale: to be had by anyone who would pay the price demanded. The Treasure was not: it was hid in a field, and could only be acquired indirectly (so to speak) by one who had got to know that the field contained it, and was prepared to acquire the field at any cost—not in the least for its own sake, but for the sake of the treasure. This does, as a matter of fact, correspond exactly to the truth of Christ's religion. He *is* accessible: He *is* to be had: directly, immediately. We all admit that and rejoice in it. The soldier who falls by the way, and is left behind to die, however careless or reckless he may have been, if in that last hour he "lift the eye of faith" to the Saviour of the world, will certainly find acceptance. Whatever he may have to suffer, here or hereafter, we feel sure that light and peace and joy will ultimately be his. Why? Because he "hath the Son"—because that supreme act of penitence and faith and spiritual desire has made the Pearl of great price his own.

To the multitude of the faithful, however, trained and schooled to seek Him where He loves to be found, He is indeed accessible thus; but also, and as a usual thing, through the means of grace. They place an immeasurable value on those means for *His* sake only whom they thus appropriate and have as their very own. The correspondence is in all points strikingly complete: and forasmuch as *Christian experience is the best interpreter of God's word*, I am utterly persuaded that these twin parables were thus intended. If so—if these two ways of becoming possessed of Christ are illustrated in all Christian life, either together or separately—then it is clear that there is no real contrariety or incompatibility between them. The "sacramental" Christian must not exclude the non-sacramental as though he were outside the grace of God; or could only doubtfully be taken in by some "uncove-

nanted stretch of mercy on the part of God. The "non-sacramental" Christian must not regard the sacramental with contempt as superstitious—as though he went about by devious and unprofitable ways to attain Christ, whilst the straight road stared him all the time in the face. This is flat bigotry and intolerance, of which indeed there is far too much on either side. If any enjoy a bad pre-eminence in bigotry, it is those non-sacramental Christians who pour abuse (both venomous and scurrilous, sometimes) upon such e. g. as seek the pardon of their sins by way of "sacramental" confession and absolution. They do so, of course, not because they disbelieve God's willingness to forgive all penitent sinners, not because they put their trust in anything but the sacrifice of Christ, but because they want to hear the assurance of their forgiveness *from His own lips*. They believe that to the true penitent Christ *does* speak with an audible voice by the mouth of His accredited representative (for this purpose). If they think this rightly, there is a great joy added to their sense of forgiveness: if wrongly, they are in fact none the worse, because their soul's desire is (wholly and solely) towards the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. There is then no room for the mutual intolerance which is so common. In countless instances it is plain that God hath received both. It is worse than useless for either to try and cast the other out.

If this much should be conceded—although one hardly dares to hope that it will be generally, or at once—the prospects of re-union might seem to be more remote than ever. For re-union "in one body" must needs be on some basis, and that an historical one. And no such basis can possibly be discovered which does not include (to some extent, at least) sacraments. Yet nothing is really lost by facing the facts. If we can but attain, by the light of reason and experience, to a clear vision of religious things *as they are:* and if, by the power of grace, we can at the same time attain to a *sympathetic* grasp of them, then surely mutual explanations, given and received,

might lead us within sight (at any rate) of unity. We were "called" separately and individually—for this "up-calling" is the most personal thing in the world. We were "called" in one body, because the Church is corporate, and has the life, the vigour, the oneness, which belongs to the living body. Much, very much, in religion is individual, is secret and sacred to the man himself, is largely moulded and modified by his needs, his convictions, his preferences even. But much, very much, in religion is (or ought to be) corporate, corresponding to the needs, the claims, the very nature, of "the body." The most clamant of these needs is that all its members hold together, pull together, work together—and that not in the way of sentiment only but so that all men see it and know it. Must we not, each and all of us, make any possible sacrifice for this greatest of ends? No sacrifice of conviction, no going back upon our own experience, is asked of us. Is it not true that the Treasure is the same Divine Thing as the Pearl, the only Thing worth having? Is it not true that we all have—to some extent—to go about to acquire the field in order to possess the Treasure which it contains? Why seek to put asunder what God hath joined together? The one stands for that inward, spiritual, "having" the Son which only is having the Life: the other stands for that outward visible Christian use and wont, consecrated by the devotion of so many centuries, witnessed to by so many testimonies of Scripture and of the Fathers, as the means of union with Christ. We may think as little as we like of the means as compared with the end: we may reject as firmly as we will any dogma of their necessity. For love's sake, for unity's sake, for the sake of Christ and His Church, we shall accept the outward for the sake of the inward.

We cannot indeed disallow it in *principle*, for the Master has certainly allowed it: we cannot refuse it in *practice*, for it forms the only possible basis of that re-union of Christendom which is so dear to the heart of Christ Himself.

The Ethical Element in St. Matthew

By A. Van Veldhuizen, D.D.,
Professor at Groningen, Holland.

I accept the solution of the Synoptic problem by the authors of the *Oxford Studies*. Accordingly I look upon St. Matthew's gospel as based on St. Mark's and posterior to it. However, Biblical Theology does not yet discriminate between the peculiarities of the Synoptical gospels, but deals in a general way with the doctrine of Jesus as laid down in the first three gospels. But we should not forget that Jesus was no biblical writer: at any rate he has not left us a particle of his writings, that is if any ever existed. If Biblical Theology is to find its material in the writings of the Bible it should not concern itself with the doctrine of which Jesus is the exponent but rather with that of which he is the central object. Whereas anywhere else harmonistic treatises have been rigorously excluded they have been tolerated here only too long. Wrede has struck out new paths, but by his untimely death his work came to an abrupt end. In his manner we must isolate each gospel from the others, paying more attention to the points of disagreement than of agreement.

We fix the date of the gospel according to St. Matthew at about 80 A. D. We do not know the name of the author. Probably he was a Judaistic Christian γραμματεύς, 7^{29}, 8^{9-21}, 15^{32}, 23^{34}, from Syria, 4^{24}. By separating his ideas from those contained in the other gospels we shall arrive at new results. For each evangelist sees

Jesus and the things about Jesus through a stained glass. We might compare the way in which Jesus is pictured to the process of lithochrome printing. The lithographical stones have each their share in producing the chromo, but taken separately they produce nothing but a vague image. In like manner Socrates appears in another light in the Platonic Dialogues than in Xenophon's Memorabilia. And yet it was the same Socrates, only seen from a different point of view. Therefore we must allow for the difference in distance from Jesus in time and place. I do not mean to say that the Apostles exaggerated intentionally. They kept the traditions handed down to them with veneration. They wrote as literally as possible what they could unearth of Jesus' sayings. Their objectivity was genuine, but nevertheless they had continually to pick and choose. Firstly, the choice of the materials differed according to their personal taste. Secondly, the oral traditions translated from the Aramaic into Greek were not always identical. There was naturally something personal in their selection. Thirdly, the facts related were to be grouped together. One gospel gave Jesus' sayings in another order than the rest. Each made another mosaic of the little bits of stone he gathered.

Especially St. Matthew has his peculiarities. He likes words and sermons of Jesus and does not care much for other historical details. The facts related circumstantially by St. Mark he condenses, sometimes even abruptly, e.g. the death of Lazarus' daughter becomes less clear in his short account. Consequently the number of doublets is considerable and, moreover, he makes no bones about doubling the number of the persons that come in contact with Jesus. The more there are the better it is.

Elsewhere his composition, especially when he discusses the sayings and the sermons of Jesus, is very good. In these materials St. Matthew goes his own way without

hesitating. He ploughs a lonely furrow. He thoroughly knows what he is about and he performs it. What Jesus has said he works up into his gospel and gives it the stamp of his personality. The order varies considerably from the other gospels. He has a predilection for certain numbers e.g. two, three, five and seven and lays stress on the continuity of the Old and New Testament. Therefore in relation to the five books of the Thora and of the Psalms he divides the sayings of Jesus into five groups marked by a typical refrain of his own, 7^{28}, 11^{1}, 13^{53} 19^{1}, 26^{1}.

Especially the difference from St. Mark, who shrinks from quoting the words of the Lord, is immense. In a booklet published in 1914 (*Het Evangelie van Markus*, Groningen, in the series: *Tekst en Uitleg*) I have described St. Mark as a very objective member of the church at Rome. He was a modest man, the mouthpiece of the Roman circle of believers. He resembles the fern and other shade-loving plants. His motto is: *Bene vixit qui bene latuit.* No man would be able to find out his name if it had not accidentally come down to us. As belonging to the church at Rome he got the facts relating to Jesus from St. Peter, their interpretation, along with this church, from St. Paul. But the Romans had gone further than their apostles. St. Paul was in the habit of seeing all things *a parte Dei.* St. Mark more than his master was a rigid predestinarian. This was owing to his time and circumstances, chiefly to the approaching end of the Jewish people, who had rejected Jesus. This all I have discussed at length in the above-named book.

A totally different person is the unknown author of St. Matthew's gospel. Tradition has not taught us his name, but we can reconstruct his characteristics. Whilst St. Mark wished to remain obscure and to hide behind the figure of Jesus, St. Matthew boldly takes up his position in front of it. He is not a fern, but a flower that

seeks sunshine. He is not a shadow, but a real person. We see him moving and fussing about. His inclinations are towards polemic and apology. The tendency is subjective. His frame of mind is negative rather than positive. Only in his gospel do we find the question τί σοι δοκεῖ; 17^{25}, 18^{12}, 21^{28}, 22^{17}, ^{42}, 26^{26}. He warns only μὴ δόξητε or μὴ νομίσητε 3^{9}, 5^{17}, 10^{34}. His natural bent is by no means Reformed or Calvinistic, rather Lutheran anthropological, or, to use the Dutch equivalent: ethical. The Roman Catholics, too, like this gospel on account of its laying stress on human action and its emphasizing the value of good works. St. Mark, on the other hand, does not trouble himself about ethics. Curiously enough the word ἄνθρωπος occurs times without number in the first gospel and as frequently he raises the question of the human responsibility, with which St. Mark does not concern himself. The reading of St. Matthew 4^{19}, (cp. St. Luke 7^{35}) is suggestive. Thus with St. Matthew each gift of God becomes a task of man.

The fact that St. Mark cares much about the plants that are stationary and passive, points in the same direction. He is a good botanist, as I have shown in *Tekst en Uitleg*. St. Matthew, however, breaks down woefully in matters botanical, confounding the mustard-plant with a branched tree, 13^{22}. There is a comical effect, 13^{31}, under influence of vs. 23 in the words ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος. No man takes a separate mustard-grain, but a handful of it when sowing it. The saying of St. Matthew reminds us rather of the catching of a flea. Though St. Matthew has no eye for plants, he is deeply interested in animals. One instance will suffice here to illustrate this peculiarity of his. He mentions a Noah's ark, 10^{16}, not found or at least not so complete in the other gospels. An interesting contrast is implied in the following words: "but beware of men." Are they worse than animals? Small wonder that the evangelist cares for the individual. His character is methodist, stressing the cure of souls.

St. Mark feels for the multitude, bringing the word ὄχλος into prominence. St. Matthew is more like a shepherd, who sympathizes with the one sheep gone astray. To him even the most humble people are of great value, 18^{10}. The following vss. 12–13 are to be considered collectively. The double ἐὰν γένηται is too much neglected. Happy he who gets his hundred sheep together, but more happy the shepherd who recovers the one sheep that was lost. Such a climax is not at all found in St. Luke. Similarly, only St. Matthew has the details of 18^{16-20}, 21^{15-16}, and the children's hosanna, 21^{31-32}.

The most instructive passage is 22^{14} (cp. the spurious 20^{16}). This differs widely from St. Paul and his scholar St. Mark. In St. Paul's opinion vocation is the sovereign act of God no man can resist. Whoever is called by God will necessarily be saved, for he is elected too (cp. Romans 8). All is considered *a parte Dei, sub specie aeternitatis*. St. Matthew, however, in a quite opposite manner places the speaking of Jesus in the everyday world of men. It becomes a fact of history. Many are invited, few come. Moreover, one of the guests does not behave himself in a manner to be welcome. Here the elected are by no means stuff for the doctrine of election. Here no Pauline abstractions, only a concrete number of welcome guests that have correctly followed the invitation.

No wonder St. Matthew likes the adjective δίκαιος. It has no parallel in the other gospels, Mt. 1^{19}, 5^{45}, 10^{41}, $13^{43, 49}$, $20^{4, 7}$, 23^{28}, $25^{37, 46}$, 27^{9-24}. It does not occur in St. Luke's parallels 13^{17}, $23^{29, 35}$. The same is the case with δικαιοσύνη, which does not occur in St. Mark and but once in St. Luke. In St. Matthew it is the central word of the Sermon on the Mount, $5^{6, 10, 20}$, 6^{1-33}, but it begins and ends with St. John the Baptist, 3^{15}, 21^{32}.

In St. Mark not one beatitude is found. He does not give honour to men. St. Matthew has the greatest number of them, followed, however, by St. Luke. Only

St. Matthew, 16^{17}, stands apart in a most interesting manner. In St. Mark the confession of St. Peter is followed by a severe warning, in St. Matthew by a praising beatitude. Likewise the "woes" are common to St. Matthew and St. Luke. Characteristic of St. Matthew are 23^{15-16} and some traits in the vss. 23–36. No other gospel lays such stress on damnation. Here St. Matthew has a constant refrain of his own, 8^{12}, $13^{42, 50}$, 22^{13}, 24^{51}, 25^{30}. The same deep earnestness of Jesus' preaching according to St. Matthew appears 7^{13}, 11^{20}, 18^{14}, 23^{15-33}. The passages quoted also by St. Luke I omit. The same tendency is seen in the reproach with want of faith. The words ὀλιγοπιστία and ὀλιγοπιστός are quite Matthean (cp. 6^{30}, 8^{26}, 14^{31}, 16^{8}.) Only the first passage is imitated by St. Luke. St. Matthew preaches human responsibility, he alone, $25^{34, 41}$. It is he who does not cease repeating the words that Israel was unwilling: it would not be saved, 22^{3}, 23^{36}, $27^{24, 62-64}$. The above examples, vainly sought for in the other gospels, emphasize the significance of the human will. Naturally St. Matthew uses much more than the other gospels the word or the idea of reward, $5^{10-12, 19}$, 6^{1-13}, $10^{32, 39-41}$, 19^{27}, etc., 20^{1-8}, 25^{31}. The gospel of the Sermon on the Mount ends as a matter of course in a command, 28^{19}.

I will not dwell too long on the chapters 5–7 which really contain the strongest arguments in favour of the ethical conception of the gospel. Here naturally the facts are more than evident. Therefore I will rather call attention to the chapter of the parables, St. Matthew 13. The composition of St. Mark 4 shows a remarkable unity. The whole chapter is full of predestination and permeated with God's omnipotent sovereignty. The rebuked people of Israel who could not understand the sayings of Jesus are under a sort of curse. Quite different is the opinion of St. Matthew: not that Israel could not, but that it would not, believe. As for St. Mark I refer the reader to my book, *Tekst en Uitleg* (*vide supra*).

In the present paper I will try to explain what St. Matthew has altered in borrowing from St. Mark.

In St. Mark the parable of the sower is but an illustration of the words ἀκούετε which reversely in St. Matthew are subordinated to the parable. St. Mark knows exactly the difference between ἀκούειν and συνιέναι, St. Matthew does not. How great a difference between Mt. 13^{10-15} and Mk. 4^{10-12}! They do not breathe in the same spiritual atmosphere. The transposition of vs. 12, the ὅτι of vs. 13, and the quotation in vs. 14 are most instructive. So is the following beatitude, vss. 16–17, of course not to be found in St. Mark. Nor does St. Matthew like the words related Mk. 4^{21-25}. They are changed by him and in a totally different context the signification becomes another, the deterministic tendency is turned into a plea for human voluntarism. Nor does the parable of the spontaneously growing seed (Mk. 4^{26-29}), suit St. Matthew; he prefers that of the tares among the wheat, vss. 24–30, and of the net with all kinds of fishes, vss. 47–50. They are divided by that of the grain of mustard and the non-Markan one of the leaven. By proceeding thus St. Matthew places the parable of the mustard-seed in another light than St. Mark does. The harsh ending of Mk. 4^{33-34} is softened down (Mt. 13^{34-35}) but it is no longer of any value before 13^{51-52}. St. Matthew has taken some old material from St. Mark and has made it into a new building of his own shaping. That is evident from 5^{13-15}. In St. Mark salt is an impersonal principle but St. Matthew yet more than St. Luke applies the idea to the very personality of the disciples, who are themselves the salt of the earth. Besides they are termed "the light of the world," again strictly personal, but St. Mark calls Jesus indirectly the light of the world (Mk. 4^{21}). In the same manner St. Matthew makes chapter 7^{2} more personal contrary to St. Luke connecting it with judging harshly. Mk. 4^{22} too is changed into a task of the disciples, 10^{26}. A comparison with St. Luke

11^{24}, etc. will show that the power of the unclean spirit of Mt. 12^{45} is due to the sin of this evil generation. Guilty, too, are the inhabitants of Nazareth, 13^{58}. St. Mark 6^{6}, however, speaks of Jesus' marvelling only. The responsibility of St. Matthew 18^{23}, etc., we find nowhere else. St. Matthew 19^{17} is an ethical deviation from Mk. 10^{18}. The peculiarities of St. Matthew 22^{11-14} are of the same character and so is Mt. 25^{29} (cp. the wholly different context of Mk. 4^{25}). The doublet Mt. 13^{12} being transposed acquires a different meaning from the corresponding passage in St. Mark.

The above facts must be considered in relation to the time in which the authors lived. The gospels are not in the first place biographical writings. They are nothing if not doctrinal and treat chiefly of their central subject Jesus Christ. But they as well as the other books of the New Testament are haunted by the question of the non-believing Jews. It was a *question brûlante* for St. Paul what to think of the rejection of his own people. So it was for his scholar St. Mark, who found the solution in the Messianic secret, which St. Matthew does not understand at all whilst copying St. Mark. For him it has become a rudiment. But St. Mark himself living at Rome towards the year 70 A. D. saw the legions going to his native land in the East. He had a premonition of the fate of his blind countrymen and knew that the nation and their city and temple were doomed to fall. There was some pity in his breast. He was silent on their guilt. He submitted to the will of God, but all the time he was sure all would soon be over with Israel.

Then came the downfall of Jerusalem. The temple was destroyed, the national power broken, the people itself subjected to the Roman yoke.

But the wandering Jews died hard. Their convictions remained and so that strong opposition against Christianity. Their religion became more spiritualized after the loss of their temple and altars, they followed the same

methods of mission as the Christians. Thence competition and polemics. In some respects they succeeded better than the Christian believers. In this way we must account for the fact that only St. Matthew reminds us of one of Jesus' sayings 23^{15}. So we understand the polemical tendency of isolated Mt. 28^{15}. The debate of the Christians with the Jews had no longer any result in the regions of Syria or Palestine, where the author of our gospel must have lived. The believers in Jesus understood better than formerly Jesus' utterances about persecution from their own experience at the hands of their countrymen, 5^{12}, ^{44}, 23^{24}.

As to the question whether the tendency was apologetic and polemical, St. Matthew does not directly try to win the Jews over or to argue with them. He only defends Christianity for its believers and lays stress on the words of Jesus concerning the mission among the heathen.

The whole gospel is an apology for the Messiah and his church. The tone he adopts towards Israel is the same we find in the rest of the writings of this Christian time, viz. the epistle to the Hebrews (80 A. D.), Barnabas (96 A. D.), St. John's Apocalypse and Gospel.

St. Matthew's ethics are transcendental. The time of eschatology has ended (cp. the χρονίζειν 24^{49}, 25^{5}). In his ethics he goes a step further than the Jews, 5^{20}. The kingdom of God becomes the kingdom of heaven. God is in heaven. In the Lord's prayer St. Matthew only has the words: Our Father in heaven. Life must become heavenly throughout.

Our evangelist scores the Jews off by setting such an excessively high celestial standard as not one human being can ever hope to come up to and consequently the only refuge is at the feet of Christ.

Only in Christ is all salvation, who is accordingly called by St. Matthew and St. Matthew alone, "the King of the kingdom of heaven."

Tillemont the Mystic

By Abbé Henri Bremond,
Paris.

Port-Royal is not a spiritual school of the first rank. It is not equal in importance to the French school, to that of Jean de Bernières, to that of Fr. Lallemant. It lacks the youth, the expansiveness, the spontaneous and overflowing life from which the great currents of mysticism are formed. These trickling rivulets, timid, confined, with their geometrically traced borders give promise of no river but of some little pond, by and by to become a pool. Full of piety and nobility as it was, the first Port-Royal has something old-fashioned about it, an affectation of antiquity. These people are archeologists, ghosts from the past. Instinctively they turn their backs on the sort of mysticism that should be the normal goal of all sanctity. By and by under the orders of Nicole they will oppose it in a positive way and with a certain tartness. Their mistrust in this regard judges and condemns them. They do not, it seems, allow themselves to be guided by the grace of which they speak so much. They mark out the path that it is to follow in them, the bounds at which its inspiration should stop. At least they should do so, were they always faithful to their principles. Happily they sometimes forget them. At Port-Royal, as everywhere else, nature, expelled by paralysing regulations, returns, not on the run, to be sure, but by short steps and cross roads. And then, action gets beyond the systems that pretend to regulate it, as can be seen especially in the Christian life, where God Himself acts with us, often, too,

against us. In short, these Port-Royalists are very interesting, very edifying and in every way superior to the sectaries, properly so called, who will presently lay claim to their prestige. But still, although there are distinguished individuals among them, history, as we understand it, the history of living Catholicism, should recognize frankly that this group of venerable Christians represents especially the past, that it troubles the present and hinders the future.

These Jacobites found their Walter Scott in Sainte-Beuve, who perhaps never wrote anything more exquisite, more judicial, more perfect than his numerous chapters on the *Messieurs de Port-Royal.* We may, we ought to retouch Sainte-Beuve's Saint Cyran and his Mother Agnes, but his portrait of M. Hamon is a real marvel. How well he knows how to read the documents, to keep only the flower, to describe and paint! He has told all and told it divinely. To attempt to repaint M. Hamon after him would be an impertinence. I shall not speak either of M. de Saci, or of M. de Pontchâteau, or of others. Is it not significant that Sainte-Beuve himself admits frankly that the best men of Port-Royal in the most precious of their characteristics are not of Port-Royal? According to him, "the fine spirituality" of M. Hamon "protests, though not in words," against the rigidity of the Jansenist school. His vivacious, tender virtue has in it nothing of their aridity. It is not "congealed on the tip of an unfeeling dogma." "Among the righteous of Port-Royal, for Port-Royal has only righteous and not saints, he is the only one of his kind."[1]

There remains for me then only M. de Tillemont, surely no mean share. Sainte-Beuve lingered long with him but did not ask of him, as he had no occasion to do, the little secret of his ingenuous, shrinking devotion. In regard to the inner life of this admirable Christian we

[1] *Port-Royal*, Vol. IV. pp. 331, 333. Let us suggest, however, that the M. Hamon of Sainte-Beuve is slightly overdone.

have two documents, his life by his secretary, M. Tronchai, who corrected the *Memoirs* of Fontaine and was surely among the best writers of Port-Royal, and, then, the *Moral Reflections of M. Le Nain de Tillemont on Various Moral Subjects*,—a bad title, dreary and misleading.[2]

Fascinated by the *Life*, which is a masterpiece, Sainte-Beuve passed lightly over the *Reflections*, which seem at first rather commonplace. He appears not to have seen that each of these reflections, so ill-named, was in fact a personal confidence, the fragment of a confession.[3] "When he was going to say mass," says M. Tronchai, "he sometimes prepared himself by little notes on piety which he made to fill his mind with good thoughts and to keep himself in a right disposition."[4]

---

[2]These two documents are usually printed together, though with separate pagination, under the common title, *La Vie et l'Esprit de M. de Tillemont*, Cologne, 1711. Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont, son of Jean Le Nain, Commissioner of Petitions and a great friend of Port-Royal, was born at Paris in 1637. In his boyhood he was sent to the *Petites Écoles* (at Port-Royal) with his brother Pierre, afterwards a Trappist, hence the relations of Tillemont with Rancé and La Trappe. He was ordained priest in 1676 and died in 1698. I say nothing of his historical work, which was continued by Tronchai. Sainte-Beuve has spoken very satisfactorily of it. Note especially his response to the cavalier disdain of J. de Maistre. This chapter of the *Port-Royal* on Tillemont (Vol. IV, pp. 1-41) really seems to me no less perfect than the two more famous ones on M. Hamon.

[3]Yet Tronchai had made himself as clear as possible on the origin of these *Reflections*. They "are for the most part outpourings of the heart . . . an examination that he made of his conscience before God and, as it were, a confession, in which he made clear to himself his most hidden states of mind." He added, strangely, "It seems that I ought to have suppressed them. Yet it is this very reason that has determined me to publish them." Here is plain speaking! But there is something to trouble us a little. Tronchai, a man of the eighteenth century and, worse still, a Jansenist, probably had not the courage to publish all these intimate papers. Sainte-Beuve, on his part, probably did not give attention to these lines of the preface, or else did not take them literally as he should have done. He turned the leaves of the *Reflections*, did not find them interesting and let them alone. I myself at first did just as he did and was going to ignore the book when I came upon a passage in which the *I* stood all unveiled.

[4]*La Vie*, p. 26.

That was his habit in other circumstances of a similar character and this is the origin of these *Moral Reflections*. He often prayed pen in hand, faithful in this, as in all the rest, to the counsel or the example of his first masters. At Port-Royal, in fact, writing materials, "*ce qu'il faut pour écrire*," were never far away from the prayer-desk. To be sure the most eminently spiritual among them hesitated to advise this aristocratic and literary method. Ink, with its deceptions, frightened them. But the humble Tillemont is the precise opposite of a man of letters. No one ever suspected him of rhetoric or even of writing for effect. His prayer, warm but quivering, gets its light from the very depths, the uttermost truth of his being. An unwinged canticle, restless yet joyous, confident yet overwhelmed. Upliftings of heart, but timid, lingering, slow, each of which shows us one of those little dramas of conscience that constitute his whole life; little for us whose conscience is more cheerful or more expansive or more frivolous, but for him of a prodigious seriousness. "We shall see with astonishment," says his biographer, "how he reproaches himself with things that do not seem reprehensible to most men of piety, and trembles in a condition beneath which multitudes think themselves wholly secure.[5]

In these peacefully lyric examinations of conscience Tillemont follows always the same rhythm and here would be, were there need of it, a fresh guaranty of the absolute sincerity of his outpourings. He starts from himself, from his daily duty; he proposes to himself this or that virtue to practise, this or that fault to combat, but whether they be virtues or faults, it must be in the rarest degree, the most subtle, most fugitive. He marshals the "For" and the "Against"; he racks his brain, goes almost distracted setting them in opposition to each other; at last he leaves it to grace to solve the problem

[5] *La Vie*, in the unpaged announcement (*Avertissement*).

and rests tranquil in this surrender. At the first an ultra-scrupulous judge, at the last a child.

Moderation difficult but necessary to avoid sin with the tongue.

We cannot remain in entire silence. We cannot even speak of holy things alone for we do not have them enough at heart. But why, at least, do we not prescribe for ourselves some degree of silence by saying nothing that is not really necessary? . . . That little check even will help us to collect our thoughts and to maintain ourselves in a gravity and modesty more worthy of a Christian.

Yes, but . . . but . . . ; the balancing clause:

But possibly, too, this check will render us more gloomy, more unsociable, less ready to bear with what displeases us.

Impasse. Darkness:

My God, how great is the multiplicity of our miseries! Can it be that the very remedies are causes of our ill!

This appeal to God brings back serenity. It is for grace itself to solve antinomies such as these. "Meantime," he stops, though free from all anguish, at the sterner resolution:

If I am unworthy to receive from you that seemly, modest cheerfulness that is the fruit of a pure conscience, may I, meantime, choose rather to seem too serious than too gay.[6]

We should not let our interest be chilled by this lack of dash and colouring. Did I promise a new *Canticle of Created Things*, another *Mystery of Jesus?* No, but rather the prayer of a critic, I had almost said a critical prayer. The thing is not so common. Do not say, either, that these are exercises in spiritual callisthenics, of affected moral nicety in the stoic fashion, rather than genuine religious outpourings. Tillemont, who had an intimate acquaintance with Marcus Aurelius, has a horror of stoicism. "The profoundest abyss of pride," he calls it. He can conceive the examination of conscience only in the form of a talk with God, with the Judge, the Father, the Saviour, Whose presence he very vividly realizes. Critical prayer, foe of all the approximations, all the parrot-like repetitions that encumber religious literature. Other

[6] *Réflexions*, pp. 98, 100.

prayers, more striking and which seek to appear more glowing, often disquiet us, or, at least, affect us but little. Here all is truth itself. Like the historical work of Tillemont it leaves in us a unique impression of solidity, of security. Consider, for instance, these few words:

> Who art Thou, Lord, if Thou wilt suffer that I ask such a question? Who art Thou, I say, according to the weak idea that we are able to draw from Thy Scriptures and Thy saints, if Thou art not charity, truth, wisdom, justice, and all that we can conceive to be eternally, essentially, unalterably, good and true, gathered into a single unity and a perfect simplicity? Whenever, then, I think that I have any love for justice, for charity, for wisdom, may I not imagine that it is Thee Whom I love?[7]

Fearing the illusions of self-love he will answer No. But after all! He defines God for himself as he would fix a date, as he would identify an historical personage. More than one reader, I trust, will find these lines not less moving than the transports of Lacordaire or of Bossuet.

Not less moving, but I do not say as noble, as religious. Far from that. In the inner life of Tillemont the religious factor enters, if one may employ a mathematical term, only as a "function" of ethics. Here, also, and this cannot be repeated too often, is to be found the distinctive feature of Port-Royal, its original defect. Their *ego* which they claim to hate is their obsession. The French school of mysticism offers to God a sacrifice of praise, Port-Royal offers moral essays, Tillemont examinations of conscience. It is, indeed, always incense that they offer, but of lesser quality. The title of one of these examinations will make my meaning clear:

> *How must one set to work to profit from the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ?*

This is almost the only place where the incarnate Word appears in these three hundred pages and it appears only to offer itself to him who wishes to "profit" from it. "Profit," most egoistic and anti-mystic of all words. Of

[7] *Réflexions*, p. 107. The whole meditation is very beautiful, but too closely reasoned and too long for citation.

course, you understand me: all this is excellent, but from a great Christian like Tillemont one might expect something more. Listen to Bérulle:

> Many strive for the virtues. That is good, necessary even. But that is not enough. I desire that they should all come to me from Jesus Christ and that it should be He that gives me them that I may have all from Him . . . and from myself nothing ever. Many seek the virtues to attain the frame of mind that right reason and their duty require. That is praiseworthy. But for me, since it has pleased God to make Himself man and to practise in His own person the virtues that we need to be perfected, I prize a virtue far more in that it makes me like Jesus Christ and that it gives me an association and connection with Him as with my pattern, than in that it makes me conformable to right reason and to my duty. For, if this latter motive is holy, the former is divine.[8]

Tillemont would not repel such thoughts, but it is not clear that they have a hold on him. With these reservations let us follow this great man, so loveable and in a worldly sense so slightly egoistic, let us follow him in his meticulous and pathetic introspections. Three matters alone occupy him, his own character, his studies, his relations with his fellow-men: three subjects of high edification, and—may his shade pardon me—more entertaining than might be supposed.

Others, St. Jerome for instance, suffer, or should suffer, from their extreme vivacity; Tillemont, gentler than a lamb, fears that this very gentleness may not be a fruit of grace, that it may lead him only to himself, "that is, to self love and to pride."

> If men search themselves thoroughly . . . they will find that they are gentle and kind toward others because they love their own repose, and that it is for that reason that they are unwilling to trouble the repose of others. This is the reason why, when their duty compels them to speak with some force, they cannot do it because they would trouble either in their own hearts or, perhaps too, in their relation to others, that tranquillity which they love and in which they take a complacent pride. . . . If the occasion calls for some act of zeal or strength they dare not . . . less for fear of offending God by rousing Him to wrath than for fear of offending men.

---

[8]Cited by Quesnel in *La Piété envers Jésus-Christ*, Liège edition, 1757, p. 19.

Let the reader clear up what is vague in these words. With Tillemont we never get away from the concrete. But who will ever tell the pitiful little affairs to which he alludes?

God guard our hearts from these false virtues and these true vices![9]

No life was ever lived more by rule, not even that of Kant. The picture that Tronchai has left us of it and that Sainte-Beuve has retouched would calm, for a while, the most agitated. But—should not calm have its evil spirits as well as storm, the evil spirits of regularity, of ease, of tepid ways?

We are living in retreat and in a certain rule of life. And we rely on that; we think we have done much; we regard ourselves as sure of our salvation. And then, ought we to be astonished if we do not wish to impose on ourselves those labours that, at the bottom of our hearts we judge to be for us unnecessary? For with such pride are we humble: we are only not aspiring to have the very first places in heaven.

Such scented virtues, might they not be paving ways to hell?

For what are we doing that the philosophers have not done? . . . Has not each in the world his inclinations? And why should there not be some who are inclined to retreat and a rule of life. Even the feeblest and the lowest intellects are sometimes among these. Let us, nevertheless, bless God for having granted us some inclination for a life that in itself is good . . . but let us put no reliance in that.

It is in vain that he closes his eyes, however; he cannot help hearing certain murmurous buzzings that come too often to disturb the repose of his hive; he cannot but suffer from them. Yet:

let us be very cautious how we disapprove the zeal that we perceive in others for any good works.

Our M. Arnauld, M. de Pontchâteau, Fr. Quesnel, and other drones, and blunderers Sainte-Beuve would have named here.

---

[9] *Réflexions*, pp. 48, 49.

If this zeal is not according to knowledge and discretion, they have their judge who will perhaps condemn the defects of their zeal less than our cold, unanimated innocence. A man who acts and works, *though he may make mistakes is* often *of greater worth than a woman* (Ecclesiasticus, XLII, 14), and of more than a cowardly and effeminate soul who does neither good nor ill, or even than one who *does diverse things, good* in themselves, but has not the ardour of the Spirit of God.[10]

And then, although one should in principle "tend to the retreat, as to one's spiritual centre," yet "every man is a soldier" when the Church is in danger. On the other hand, a state of war endangers the inner spiritual life:

One must have a care not to take pleasure in the excitement, the affairs, the outward lustre of good works, lest we lose ourselves in pretending that we are saving others.

How hard it is to know one's duty! In case of doubt let us choose the side most contrary to our inclinations. Let M. Arnauld make a vow of silence, M. de Tillemont of contention!

We must . . . abandon this meekness, suffer loss of the honour that it gains for us among men, and defend Jesus Christ with the sword, that is, with a generous vigour that pierces His adversaries to the heart. . . . No one asks meekness or coolness of a soldier who is fighting sword in hand.[11]

The lamb has become a lion. These are, I repeat, no mere phrases. Hard as it may be to picture Tillemont sword in hand I would make oath that in one way or another that resolution was kept valiantly.

His studies caused this infinitely sensitive conscience no less anxiety. Is it not to fall once more into "the vanity of the philosophers,"

to labour greatly to know holy things, the acts of the saints, the history of the Church, its discipline, its teaching even . . . if one stops short at that knowledge without passing to the fruit . . . that one should draw from it to rule one's life? Is not this even to add profanation to vanity?

I force myself with reluctance to abridge this fine passage:

---

[10] *Réflexions*, pp. 95, 96.
[11] *Réflexions*, pp. 110, 113.

My God, the more I feel that I am too weak to avoid this abuse the more I take refuge in Thy omnipotent mercy. Take from me the spirit of curiosity. Grant me not to study the acts of Thy saints either that I may take delight in a vain idea of knowledge or be puffed up by the empty praise of others. Experience has taught me that one finds here even more darkness than light, that one must often be content with uncertain conjectures, that one is often mistaken even when one takes the greatest pains not to be so. But, besides, even though one should succeed better than all others, till one is doing only what people without piety and even heretics can do also; and, after all, the devils will know all this better than we. Shall we make it our boast that we are getting a little nearer the devils? Lord . . . may the desires of my heart tend only to Thee, and if my mind must turn to other things because it is too weak to fill itself with Thee alone, may I lament and humble myself at my ill fortune, even as one to whom the prince might commit the care of his buildings because he was not capable of undertaking the most important affairs of state.[12]

Many a time, one may suppose, he had desired to give up the task which he feared he loved too well. He stood by it only at the formal order of his spiritual director, whom he obeyed like a child.

If I am not to leave the work and the study in which I am engaged, should I not, at leas , reduce it, especially before mass and, at least, on Sundays and festivals? Is it possible that I might not occupy myself for a few hours in some pious reading without wearying myself and without the fear that this weariness might throw me into sloth? . . . Is it not true that I am losing the taste for holy things because I have too much attraction, too great attachment, too much eagerness for my work?[13]

If I should apply myself, he says, to the history of the saints with the sole idea of "profiting" by the examples and the lessons which they afford me, the study

would not puff up my mind, it would not dry up my heart; I should be always ready to leave it to take up readings of a yet holier kind and to present myself before Thee in prayer. I should not prolong insensibly and under diverse pretexts the time I give to study to lessen, out of distaste, the time due to other tasks.[14]

Absorbed, withered by this dangerous passion, will he not even go so far as to forget the needs of his brothers, the duties of charity?

---

[12] *Réflexions*, 18, 20.
[13] *Réflexions*, p. 99.
[14] *Réflexions*, p. 21.

I grudge sometimes the time that I have to give either to talking with others or to thinking about what I ought to say to them. I grudge the books that I have to lend them. And so avarice gets the better of me in many ways.[15]

To grudge lending his books, that, no doubt, was Tillemont's greatest sin.

"Ah, Sir," wrote on the day after his death another of the writers of Port-Royal, the excellent, admirable Thomas du Fossé, fellow pupil and dear "old friend" of Racine, "Ah, Sir, how the scholar whom we have just lost will be a reproof to other scholars. I believe God gave him to the Church to teach ecclesiastics to study and to use their study only in relation to the good of the Church and to put away all the superfluities with which men ordinarily burden their minds and memories. Knowledge of curious, extraordinary, little-known facts . . . is rather what puffs up studious men . . . I believe that there have hardly been any in this century or for many centuries who had more facts in their heads than the scholar of whom I speak, and no man had his mind less spoiled or his heart less puffed up by it . . . In his application to a theme which is itself so dry and which often dries up piety he always preserved the unction of the spirit of God."[16]

His books did not make him indifferent to the interests of his fellow men. How he shall bear himself, even in the details of his every-day acts, with his kinsmen, his friends, his servant, with the just men of Port-Royal, with the "wayward," and even with certain personages who had been dead for ages but whose shades haunted his study, such is the constant, keen anxiety of this learned man, of this hermit, who in any case talked so little, such is the chief object of his reflections, of his examinations of conscience and of his prayer.

Good-natured and compliant as we know him to be, yet

---

[15] *Réflexions*, pp. 36, 37.

[16] Cited by Tronchai in the *Vie*, pp. 144, 145. Tronchai, for his part, says: "Criticism is a dry study which almost always has some bad effect on the piety of those who make of it their chief occupation. Happy those scholars whose hearts do not feel the aridity of it!" Tillemont was of that number. "A word that he utters sometimes in passing over a fact carries with it the impression of a lively, ardent faith" (*Avertissement*). It would be opportune to search out and cite the "words" to which Tronchai alludes and to put them beside words of quite different character that Gibbon permits himself to utter, especially in the Notes.

he knows how to preserve and energetically to defend at need his independence as a scholar and as a Christian, especially as a Christian. We have his reply to the anonymous complaints of a writer whose inadequate knowledge he had criticized and whom he had reproached, very suavely to be sure, for having "copied another author without citing him." It is a good piece of work, and every writer would do well to read it over once a year.

> If I have been obliged sometimes to state that I was not in accord with your views, which could not well be done without indicating what seemed to be lacking in your proofs, excuse it, I beg you, in view of the exigency in which those are placed whose researches are not altogether superficial. If I said that you copied Fr. Hardouin about the works of St. Dionysius (Denis), Fr. Hardouin is not an enemy of the truth, whom it is a crime for anyone to follow. . . . I should be slow to object to anyone's copying others, for, so far as I can, I do nothing else; and I make public declaration of this by citing them . . . .
>
> God forbid that I should dispute with you or with anyone about the taste for antiquity, lest I lose the taste for piety which is of far other importance. The grace which I ask of God is that I may in my heart with sincerity rank myself beneath you and all men.

He would make himself smaller still if he could, but when all is said he stands by his positions:

> Yet I must use the talent that it has pleased God to give me,

and I must defend good critical methods. With a thousand gracious arts he forces the point home before he closes:

> I am under obligation to you for many things that I have learned in your books, as I am careful to acknowledge by citing them, whenever occasion may arise for it.

The unnamed writer took his lesson well, or pretended to. "Tillemont went to see him soon after and was received by him as was his due. . . . They saw one another later once or twice, emulating each other in courtesies and tokens of friendship."[17]

The same independence, the same abounding veneration and tenderness is shown towards his parents. There is a long meditation, quite definite in its application, on

[17] *Vie*, pp. 96-103. It is a long letter.

this principle, "That parents ought not to take it ill that children are not guided by them in affairs of conscience."

They should think it good that their children, their nephews and so forth, receive their guidance from another and have more confidence in him than in themselves. That is hard, however, and I suspect that many fathers say in their hearts what they would not say with their lips, that they would prefer that their children might have less piety so that they would confide rather in them than in strangers.

This passage seems quite surprising when we consider the lofty character of M. and Mme. Le Nain. Two Latin words interjected in passing throw a little light on the enigma.

However good, wise, holy they may be, they (parents) always love us a little according to the flesh and it is very hard even for the very best of them not to say to us in their hearts: *Manifesta teipsum mundo* (Show thyself unto the world).

Probably M. Le Nain very innocently wished that a little reflected glory at least might make up to him for being deprived of his son, always withdrawn into some solitude. M. Tronchai tells on this subject a very touching anecdote, the truth of which cannot be questioned. When M. de Tillemont

had given his first volume to the public the *Journal des Savants* spoke of the author and of the work in a very appreciative way. M. Le Nain, the father, wanted to get him to read this article, but M. de Tillemont begged to be excused. He replied that it was not well to nurse his pride on any too favourable opinion that people might have of him.[18]

Graver conflicts, too, there may have been between father and son. The *Reflections* give much occasion to

---

[18] *Vie*, pp. 52, 53. "For the same reason he did not wish to have his name appear on the title page of his books. It was contrary to his desire that a few letters from it were put there. Still, he could not hide it." But everybody does not know "that he turned over to M. Hermant the lives of St. Athanasius, of St. Basil, of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of St. Ambrose. . . . In the same way he communicated (to Du Fossé) those of Tertullian and of Origen, . . . that of St. Cyprian to the translator of that Father, . . . and many other parts of his work to various persons. All the thanks he asked of them was that they should not let it be known." *Loc. cit.* p. 51. Arnauld followed another method. He signed. Nicole wrote. To each his own grace! *Multae mansiones* (Many mansions).

speculate on this. Tillemont, usually so pacific, becomes animated, almost irritated. Surely he is in pain:

When will it be right to say: *Quid tibi et mihi est, mulier* (Woman, what is that to me and thee)? If not when a man would concern himself with what regards the guidance of his soul? . . . The Apostles themselves do not wish to lord it over our faith. The most enlightened spiritual directors may be mistaken. How much greater occasion has a father to think that he, too, may go astray!

Peace will return, as always, but not without pain:

My God, Thou knowest how great my troubles are sometimes in this matter. Thou hast given me a father whom I have every reason in the world, not alone to love, but to esteem and to honour, even though he were not my father. And yet I fear that I often wound him by not showing him enough openness and not making myself sufficiently partner of his feelings. It seems to me that I could have no greater joy than to please him in all things and I know well that this would never involve my doing anything that was absolutely bad. . . . But one becomes withdrawn from Thee by many a seeming trifle. . . . I wish to love my father and I ought; but I would fain love him only because I ought and through the love that Thou givest me for him. . . . For, in this way, I shall have none of that low fear of wounding him if occasions should arise in which Thy command would oblige me to do it.[19]

The serious M. Le Nain—(he seems to have been a little stern—there was no need to be very much so to rouse Tillemont's scruples)—doubtless never suspected the distress which this curious passage reveals to us. We shall never know either—and I much regret it—the names of the flesh and blood people of whom Tillemont was thinking when he meditated on "the necessity of breaking off all relations with the wayward."

It is a very grievous thing to be associated with those who do not fear God. . . . The wayward even presume on the ties of friendship which they have with those who pass for good men.

Let us bear witness

by withdrawing ourselves that, at the least, we disapprove of the evil we cannot prevent.[20]

But to withdraw is not always possible for him, and besides he knows very well that such a flight would not solve all the difficulty.

[19] *Réflexions*, pp. 253, 258.
[20] *Réflexions*, pp. 217, 218.

May I love Thee, My God! . . . May I love Thy saints and Thy servants as they deserve! May I love even the wayward, because they may become good! May I condemn these estrangements and these repugnances! May I labour to destroy them! May I utter my cry to Thee, lest I lose myself in losing charity toward my brother man! And then, when in sincerity I long to love him, may I not have some confidence that I shall love him . . . and, then, testify of my friendship to him in the desire to win him even by these outward signs?

Is he not, perhaps, even now but too ready to love them?

Answer me, if Thou wilt, O Truth, to Whom I appeal. . . . Take from me . . . that base flattery which seeks to please others in order to enjoy the vain sweetness of this life, bearing witness of esteem for those whom it scorns. . . . May I love my neighbour to lead him to Thee and to that end may I tell him frankly whatever in him seems to me a hindrance to his salvation! If I am constrained to bear with faults without being able to correct them, may it be in sadness of heart. . . . If I must appraise what is good in any, may it never be beyond my sincere estimate of it. . . . My God, what a multitude of faults I commit every day in this regard, not, as it seems to me, to deceive others, but that I may not wound a friendship that is sweet to me, not wound the peace of the world.

Here more than ever Sainte-Beuve fails us, first in not sharing our wonder at these commotions, these tender avowals of a sensitive conscience, and then, by not helping us to discover the names of those wayward ones whose friendship "sweetened"—but, alas, with a "vain sweetness"—the life of Tillemont. Possibly they were other learned men, unhappily involved in the Molinist error. Why not Fr. Hardouin or some other of the brotherhood? Possibly some scholarly free-thinkers (*libertins*). I incline to the Molinists. This is mere conjecture.

The close of this admirable section is rather baffling. It seems as though Tillemont were insensibly forgetting the wayward of his own society to meditate on the problem of evil, on the "wayward" of universal history. Possibly, too, he mixes somewhat the two groups, the "persecutors" of the present day recall to him those of old time. That is apt to be the way with Port-Royal.

They persecuted the saints . . . because they did not love truth; . . . they did not understand how God governs his creatures

. . . how He acts on our minds and on our hearts. . . . That is what made the Diocletians and the Deciuses and all the other persecutors of the truth.

But, no! He forgets the petty present. Tillemont is here no longer the friend of Port-Royal but solely the historian of the emperors. See him then at grips with phantoms, more real for him than living men, phantoms that gave him so much perplexed offense, so many nightmares, with Trajan, with that Marcus Aurelius, over whom Renan, two centuries later, will weep "as though he had died yesterday."[21]

Suffer, Lord, that I ask of Thee if Thou destroyest always those who comprehend not the works of Thy hands, those who betray their brethren by words of peace? In the sight of all Thou hast destroyed Nero, Domitian and others, but hast Thou likewise destroyed Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, who surely deserved punishment for not comprehending the marvels of Thy grace which they had before their eyes, and yet persecuted Thy servants? They, however, died in their beds, honoured, revered, beloved, esteemed by all men. How many faithless ones enjoy to the end the fruit of their perfidy and possess Naboth's vineyard without even being killed at the last like Ahab! But yet they die. And what an awful destruction when they see justice and truth rise up against them with an almighty hand that nothing now can stay.[22]

So much for the wayward. The righteous give him other perplexities. Who would have thought it! His every-day companions, the *Messieurs de Port-Royal*, were not for him an unmixed good! Touching fact, this learned man would have desired a little more tenderness on their part. He laments, not their coolness, but the sinful exigencies of his own self-esteem.

We can bear many things from a person when we are sure that he loves us from his heart, whatever indiscretion, whatever brusqueness, whatever ill-humour he may show. And if we love our brother we shall not find it hard to believe that he loves us. . . . It is usually a rash judgment to conclude that people do not love us and one that arises from the fact that we ourselves do not love.[23]

That would be of small account. They have another fault, more serious, the pet sin of Port-Royal, sanctified backbiting. This vice

---

[21] *Marc-Aurèle*, p. 488.
[22] *Réflexions*, pp. 246-253.
[23] *Réflexions*, pp. 138, 139.

is to be dreaded even among pious people and we must watch over ourselves in the talks that we have with the wisest, the most saintly, the most God-fearing, with the angels, if one dare speak so, and the angels of light. . . .

Although they may say nothing that is not exactly true, it is often dangerous, especially for the weak, to know the faults of others.

They sigh aloud over the delinquencies of their own holy men, of M. de Singlin for instance. With what freedom will they not speak of their adversaries!

My God, guard, if Thou wilt, my mouth and my lips, guard my ears, guard my heart.

With regard to the Molinists themselves,

I never speak of their faults, neither through hate nor malevolence nor to exalt myself above them. . . .

Guard my ears, my God, that I may not love to hear such things said about others which Thy truth tells me I could not say of them myself.

Timid and of small account, if I cannot "arrest" the written or spoken "Provincial Letters,"

may I testify either by my silence or by a serious and sombre expression that I cannot approve that which Thy justice condemns.

May I respect, then, Lord, those whom I have reason to believe are loved by Thee. But may I join the prudence of the serpent to the harmlessness of the dove, that I may imitate the holy Virgin who cast in her mind even the words of Thy archangel! May I distinguish in Thy saints (of Port-Royal) the effects of Thy grace from what still lurks in them of human infirmity. May I not approve in them things which they perhaps condemn in themselves more than I am able to do.[24]

There remains his own little kingdom, his secretary, his attendants, all those for whom he is responsible before God.

Thou has laid upon me the charge of but few persons, and even for those few I have need of the wisdom that Solomon asked of Thee for a great people. . . . None is worthy to share in the care of Thy Church nor, in consequence, to have a part in Thy priesthood if he take not heed of what he owes to his own household.

The "patience required to bear with their faults without ill-nature" is not what troubles him. The harder thing for him is to leave the Roman emperors to watch over the conduct of this little world, to give place to those continual "suspicions" which, as St. Augustine teaches,

[24] *Réflexions*, pp. 173, 179.

"are necessary in the case of those with whom we are charged." More troublous still is it to rebuke them:

> Grant me still strength to reprove them if they commit faults of any importance, without fear of troubling either their peace or my own, or rather our common slackness, for the peace that is not based on truth, on piety, on justice, is not a true peace.[25]

I am lingering longer perhaps than is fitting in this cell, dedicated to the minute and impassioned study of Christian duty. And yet I have had to leave untouched many beautiful passages which I had promised myself to restore to the light; and yet we have in the collection of *Moral Reflections* doubtless but a small number of these daily writings, the rest having been destroyed either by Tillemont himself or through the timidity of his editor. The very part that was most personal in it, most picturesque, most deeply stirred, in a word, least Jansenist, Tronchai would not have reproduced. If we had it complete, this great man would perhaps seem to us less retired within himself, less exclusively possessed by the fear of doing ill, of a less egoistic religion, in short of a fervour very closely allied to that of the mystics. A sublime passage which I have kept for the close allows such a conjecture.

> *Inner piety is the soul of Christianity, it begins in time what is to be the occupation of saints in eternity.*
>
> It is not our voices that God hears, says St. Cyprian, but our hearts. So true piety, true worship . . . these, when they are alone, are not all the outward expressions of religion, but such an expression is found also in that inner adoration by which the soul humbles itself deeply before its Creator, to submit itself absolutely to His will.
>
> If this inner piety, which is peculiar to the Christian religion, could be perfected in this life it would produce in it perhaps a worship and an adoration wholly interior and wholly spiritual, as with the angels. But that which it cannot do now it will do some day in heaven, where the saints will adore and praise God without ceasing by the divine canticles that love will form in their hearts, uninterrupted by the tumult of voices and of corporeal sounds that pass away, for there will be nothing there save what is changeless and eternal.

The better to understand and appreciate this passage we should recall to what a degree Tillemont was a Church-

[25] *Réflexions*, pp. 143, 144.

man, and ecclesiastic. Rubrics, parochial offices, processions, on all these matters he would have satisfied even the very precise Bourdoise. "He served ordinarily as deacon at high mass. At the great festivals in which he helped throughout the whole office he was almost constantly at church from four o'clock in the morning till toward five in the evening. When he did not go to the parish church for vespers he chanted them in his chapel at four o'clock." Besides "he loved extremely the Gregorian chant, which he had learned on his own initiative in quite early youth and he knew it so thoroughly that he composed very well in it."[26] But let us resume:

> It is in heaven that, in the fulness of God Himself, and in the enjoyment of His truth by a contemplation full of light and ardour, we shall sing his praises, not with syllables that pass away from us before they have even been heard and with words as imperfect as the faith that evokes them is obscure, but in a silence worthy of His greatness. All the passions that rend us now with so many conflicting desires, all the differing purposes of created beings that give us so much distraction in prayer, all the vain imaginings and thoughts that come from the inconstancy and fickleness of our minds, all these will be silent then. Nothing will interrupt our silence, and each soul, completely gathered into itself, or rather into God, by a bliss the precise opposite of that outer darkness with which Jesus Christ threatens his enemies, will see no longer anything but God, will no longer hear or taste anything but God, at last will no longer love anything but God.[27]

"Humbly, lingeringly, monotonously," we might say now with Sainte-Beuve, yet relying on documents that

---

[26] *Vie*, pp. 24, 29. There are some quite curious details on this subject. He says in the *Reflections:* "If we are alone we make a pastime of singing, we let fancy play with the first dream picture that occurs to us." *Réflexions*, p. 164. On the other hand, and still as a comment on the passage that we are citing, "he was very glad when they brought little children to mass and did not dread to hear them cry as much as people usually do. Their cries, he said, following the words of a holy Father, are their prayers. . . . He would have liked to say to those who could not bear them what St. Poemen, an abbot in Egypt, said to his brothers who wished to leave their retreat because they heard there the crying of children: 'It is on account of angel voices, then, that you wish to abandon this spot'." *Vie*, p. 76. Tillemont and the children, a beautiful theme, but it would be rash to attempt it after Sainte-Beuve!

[27] *Réflexions*, pp. 183, 185.

Sainte-Beuve did not know,—"heedful to hide himself from notice in the furrow that he delves," we have followed Tillemont, "and we have gradually raised ourselves . . . even to those accents that have, I trust, just touched us by their depth and their tenderness, by a sort of angelic beauty."[28] But in prolonging our interview with him I had less desire to yield to the pleasure of admiration than to that of understanding and of definition. Tillemont is for us that sole, ideal witness, whom it is always so hard to find. Better than the disturbing and the disturbed spirits of Jansenism, better than Lancelot, who has in him elements of illuminism and who lacks sound sense, better than M. Hamon, who was too eccentric to be of any school, this peaceful scholar seems the most authentic, the most "unexceptionable" representative of the whole group. I have not forgotten that this pupil of the *Petites Écoles* belongs to the second generation of Port-Royal, but I recognize as Sainte-Beuve does that he remained the complete disciple of the elder generation, "the pupil in uprightness, who knew no shadow of turning." In him the traditions of pre-sectarian, pre-Jansenist Port-Royal are continued. Those men had their faults, of which we have sufficiently spoken; they had their grandeurs also, such as I have just recalled in telling of the inner life of Tillemont. *Sancte educatus, sancte vixit* (Brought up in holiness, he lived in holiness). A righteous man, but not quite a saint. Those men were archeologists, who, in their desire to bring to life again the Church of old time, too far ignored the Church of the present and trammelled, either in themselves or in those about them, the providential developments that it was the mission of Francis de Sales, Bérulle, Condren, Olier, Eudes, Surin and so many others to promote. They were timorous, overscrupulous. For them Sinai hid the hill of the Beatitudes. They knew only the Law written on tables of stone or in the canons of the ancient councils; they had not under-

[28] *Port-Royal*, p. 23.

stood that the surest way to save one's soul is to lose it, to forget it. But their charity should suffice to cover far more vexatious limitations. Through it they kept in touch with the communion of saints, the saints of their own day. They resisted, as well as they could, the example, the pressure of the great Arnauld, the fatal invasion of the sectarian spirit. Doubtless their openheartedness exaggerated to itself the merits of many of their friends, but they had not the weakness, "the great weakness," as Tillemont says, "not to distinguish sufficiently in the saints what is in them of themselves and what of God."[29] As for what displeases them in the enemies of their friends they know how to be still about it. They do not denounce moral laxity, they are content to combat it in themselves, topsy-turvy casuists, who are no less subtle on fraternal charity than on the other virtues. Admirable Christians, men who had, as well as those others, a providential mission to fulfil. If only the fundamental unity be not riven there is a need for minorities, for men behind the times, whose peaceful resistance tempers the impetuosity of the young schools and makes the connection closer between the past and the present. M. Le Maitre, M. de Saci, M. Hamon, M. de Tillemont, no! these ghosts of the past are not superfluous among us. They come back to us from such a fair country, rich with all the treasures of a Christian antiquity that shines even more in their lives than in their writings. They belong to us with almost all their being.

---

[29] *Réflexions*, p. 176.

CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY
Vol 5, 1917

CBPaQ

3 2400 00273 0434
GTU Library